



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2020

No. 94

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of our destiny, You have watched over us from generation to generation. May our lawmakers trust Your faithfulness during this challenging season of our Nation's history. Lord, inspire them to recall how You have sustained this land we love in prosperity and adversity, in peace and in war. Give our Senators the wisdom to believe that they can trust Your constancy and greatness as they cling to Your promise to never leave or forsake them. Believing in Your power, help us all to face fresh challenges with total confidence in You.

And, Lord, we pray for the health and safety of all as communities begin the process of reopening businesses.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA AND THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I am deeply concerned about reports that China began hoarding medical

supplies in early January while working to prevent the World Health Organization from sounding the alarm about the virus pandemic.

By analyzing international trade data, the Department of Homeland Security assessed that the Chinese Government intentionally concealed the severity of COVID-19 from the world in early January in order to stockpile medical supplies. Furthermore, the Chinese Communist Party Government tried to hide its actions by denying there were any export restrictions. They even tried to obscure and delay its trade data so it wouldn't get caught.

These acts are outrageous.

Even worse, the CIA and foreign intelligence agencies have found evidence that China threatened the World Health Organization to stop cooperating on efforts to combat COVID-19 if the organization declared a global health emergency early on. So it was declared, and, hence, there was valuable time lost in fighting the virus.

This is simply unacceptable behavior. The Chinese Communist Party ought to be held accountable for the countless lives that have been lost around the globe due to its nontransparent, aggressive, inhumane behavior.

The World Health Organization is composed of many honorable and dedicated medical professionals who believe in the WHO's mission. If any of them were privy to what was going on by the Chinese Communist Party, he ought to step forward and shine light on any misdeeds by the organization's leadership.

Whistleblowers are necessary to prevent corruption within any institution, which is why I have a longstanding reputation of protecting whistleblowers. The world deserves to know what the World Health Organization's leaders knew and when they knew it. The evidence is quickly becoming crystal clear—that China is responsible for tremendous suffering worldwide through

its lies and active coverup. Telling the truth about the Chinese Communist Party does not, as some have suggested, have any bearing on how we analyze our domestic response.

We should learn from democratic countries that have been successful in containing outbreaks, like Taiwan and South Korea. However, in going forward, everyone around the world should have his eyes open about the true nature of the Chinese regime.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the coronavirus pandemic continues to challenge our Nation, and the Senate is here working for the American people.

Our committees have called in experts like Dr. Fauci and leaders like Chairman Powell to discuss the CARES Act and the path toward reopening. We are tracking the effects of the largest rescue package ever and are considering next steps, like strong legal protections so that doctors, small businesses, schoolteachers, and universities do not face a second epidemic of frivolous lawsuits.

The Senate is also staying on top of other threats that predated COVID-19—the meddling of Putin's Russia, the brutal Chinese Communist Party, rogue states like Iran and North Korea, foreign terrorists such as ISIS.

Two weeks ago, we overwhelmingly confirmed an impressive leader for the National Counterintelligence and Security Center, whom Acting DNI Grenell has announced will play a central role in briefing candidates and campaigns on foreign threats against our elections.

Today, our colleagues on the Intelligence Committee, now led by Acting

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2481

Chairman RUBIO, will report out the President's nominee to be the next Director of National Intelligence, and, last week, we reauthorized essential tools that our intelligence community needs to defend our homeland, track our enemies, and protect Americans.

But we didn't stop there.

Over the last several years, we have been painfully reminded that our Nation and our liberties are not only threatened from without. The fabric of our country is also hurt when tools and capabilities that are meant to keep us safe are abused in ways that are, at best, reckless, sloppy, and unaccountable—or, worse, polluted by political bias.

In 2016, the FBI embarked on a counterintelligence investigation against Donald Trump's campaign for the Presidency. Federal law enforcement used taxpayer money to scrutinize a political campaign in the middle of a democratic election. You would have thought such a radical step must have sprung from an air-tight justification. Certainly, you would think the outgoing Obama administration should only have used the awesome power of the Federal Government to pry into their political rivals if they had had a slam-dunk basis for doing so, but that is not what they had.

In one instance, the FBI got permission to surveil a Trump associate by telling half-truths, blurring evidence, and citing sketchy sources like a dossier of partisan opposition research that had been funded by the Hillary Clinton campaign and the DNC.

Here is how even the New York Times explained the recent findings of the Justice Department's inspector general: "The FBI had cherry-picked and misstated evidence about the Trump adviser . . . when seeking permission to wiretap him."

That was from the New York Times.

So an American citizen's campaign for the American Presidency was treated like a hostile foreign power by our own law enforcement, in part, because the Democratic-led executive branch manipulated documents, hid contrary evidence, and made a DNC-funded dossier a launch pad for an investigation. The inspector general counted seven significant inaccuracies and omissions. Here is his report:

We identified multiple instances in which factual assertions relied upon in the [FBI's] FISA application were inaccurate, incomplete, or unsupported by appropriate documentation based upon information the FBI had in its possession at the time the application was filed.

Did you catch that last part? It was based upon information the FBI had in its possession at the time the application was filed. So we are either talking about gross incompetence or intentional bias. Does any Senator think it is acceptable for any Federal warrant application to include seven significant inaccuracies and omissions? But this wasn't just a run-of-the-mill warrant; it was a FISA warrant to snoop on a Presidential campaign.

This is just one of the realities that President Trump's Democratic critics spent years calling conspiracy theories or inventions of the President's mind. Yet here it is in black and white from exactly the kind of independent inspector general the Democrats rushed to embrace when convenient.

Sadly, this was no isolated incident. Just recently, Attorney General Barr has had to take the incredible step of unwinding the DOJ prosecution of another former Trump adviser because the government's case against him was unfair and distorted as well.

It was largely on the basis of these proceedings that the Democrats and the media spent years being fixated on wild theories of Russian collusion, but upon investigation, the Mueller investigation—remember that one?—it is those wild allegations that collapsed along with the credibility of several of these investigations that helped to create the cloud of suspicion in the first place.

In the words of our distinguished Attorney General:

The proper investigative and prosecutorial standards of the Department of Justice were abused. . . . We saw two different standards of justice emerge, one that applied to President Trump and his associates and the other that applied to everybody else. We can't allow this ever to happen again.

That is from the Attorney General.

Oh, and by the way, as if this debacle needed even more shocking behavior, I understand a Federal judge may try to continue prosecuting one of these cases even though the prosecution itself wants to drop it. The judge has taken it upon himself to go browsing for other hostile parties. Obviously, that subverts our constitutional order in which the executive alone decides whether to prosecute cases.

So, look, no matter what some Washington Democrats may try to claim, you are not crazy or a conspiracy theorist if you see a pattern of institutional unfairness toward this President. You would have to be blind not to see one.

All of this is why the Senate passed important FISA reforms in last week's bill—to help bring accountability and transparency into that flawed process—and we aren't nearly finished.

As soon as possible, the full Senate will vote on Mr. RATCLIFFE's nomination. The President will have a Senate-confirmed DNI who can pursue the vital national security work of our tireless intelligence community while he can also ensure that the IC stays out of politics and out of the papers.

Just yesterday, Chairman GRAHAM announced the Committee on the Judiciary will vote on a serious new set of subpoenas so the Senate can hear directly from key players like James Comey, Andrew McCabe, Loretta Lynch, and many others to continue getting to the bottom of this. Let me say that again. The Senate Republicans are taking steps to issue subpoenas to a wide variety of Obama administration officials who have some

relationship to the abuses I have just laid out. The American people deserve answers about how such abuses could happen, and we intend to get those answers.

I have been a strong supporter of law enforcement and the intelligence community during my career. The American people sleep safer because dedicated people are protecting our country and bringing our foes to justice. It is precisely because I support these missions that I feel so strongly this malpractice cannot be tolerated and must never be repeated.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE DiSILVESTRO

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Madam President, on another matter, it is my honor to help bid farewell to a distinguished staff leader, who has himself handled sensitive security matters with great care and dedication.

For more than 30 years, this body has functioned more safely and smoothly because Mike DiSilvestro was on the clock as Director of the Office of Senate Security. Mike D.'s job is tough to describe. That is partially because long tenured all-stars like Mike have a way of carving out their own niche, but it is mostly because his work is literally classified. Mike has been in charge of the Office of Senate Security almost as long as I have been in the Senate.

He came on board as Acting Director in 1987. He took over a brandnew office with incredibly important and sensitive functions. The details are not for public consumption, but let's say there were two main missions.

First, Mike has managed, modernized, and expanded the secure facilities and systems that provide classified information in the Capitol to Senators and committees as we govern the country. He has simultaneously been a diplomatic liaison to the executive branch and has advocated for the Senate's prerogative, and he has been a skillful manager of people and logistics, who has made sure our secrets stay secret once they arrive here.

Second, Mike has been one of our top leaders on the security of the Senate itself. He helps to plan for contingencies and guard every facet of our institution, its people, and its systems from outside actors with bad intentions.

These are tall orders—even for a fellow graduate of the University of Louisville. Consider how much has changed in the 37 years since Mike first came to the Senate and in the 32 years he has held this job: major wars, terrorist strikes on the homeland, anthrax in the Hart Building, countless technological advances that have made his task radically more complex. Imagine guarding some of the Nation's most closely held secrets, planning for possible attacks on the institution, and still being unanimously described by your colleagues as calm, cool, and even-keeled.

Mike is no cheap people pleaser. His duties don't permit it. When you see

Mike outside his secure facility and heading our way, it does not mean a social call—it means bad news—and you had better believe this stoic sentinel has had to say no a lot more than yes. Just doing the job half as reliably and reassuringly as Mike is a herculean task by itself, but then factor in the fact that he is also one of the most personally well-liked and respected colleagues among the circle of folks with whom he has worked.

Mike D.'s reputation extends far outside the Senate. I have it on good authority that, when Secretary of Defense Esper—who served as national security adviser to a former majority leader—comes to Senate Security to brief us Members, he doesn't consider his visit complete until he has stopped in Mike D.'s office to check on his old colleague.

Yet, ironically, outside a select circle, most people in the Senate itself probably could not pick Mike D. out of a lineup. I guess, when everything you work on is strictly "need to know," you wind up on a need-to-know basis yourself. Even Mike's own teammates describe his approach as somewhat "stealth-like."

In short, even to his beloved Senate, Mike has remained somewhat mysterious. It is definitely a good sign for all of us that he has never become a household name, but some careful intelligence work on our own has turned up clues about Mike D.'s next assignment. His well-earned retirement will bring more hikes, more long runs, a lot more golf, and more time with the family he treasures. He may miss his colleagues and the importance of his job, but I don't think tears will be shed for the end of those heroically long commutes on I-95 which took place at all hours, day and night, whenever duty called.

I can't offer Mike any higher praise than to repeat what he actually already knows.

The Senate has been safe and secure for more than a generation because of you. Decades of Senators have gotten the information we need because of you. Some people spend their whole careers wondering if they have made a difference. You have not needed to ask that for almost 40 years, and you will never need to ask it again.

Mike, we are going to miss you, but old habits die hard, and we simply aren't willing to sever all ties.

So, this morning, the Senate will officially designate Mike as Senate Security's Director Emeritus. The Office's first-ever Director will become its first-ever Director Emeritus.

But don't worry, Mike. Your new job description will just be a little bit lighter. I hope the biggest mystery you have to tackle for a while will be whether to play 9 holes on Saturday or fit in 18. The Senate and your country thanks you for everything you have done.

DIRECTOR EMERITUS OF SENATE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 582, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 582) designating Michael P. DiSilvestro as Director Emeritus of Senate Security of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 582) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate Banking Committee this morning will hear testimony from Secretary Mnuchin and Federal Reserve Chairman Powell about the economic distress caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. This testimony from the Secretary and the Chairman of the Fed is one of the requirements that Senate Democrats secured in the CARES Act, and we have been pushing for it to happen for several weeks. The fact that it has taken so long is, once again, one more indication that our Republican Senate colleagues are not focused on the COVID crisis but on other diversionary issues, as witnessed by Leader MCCONNELL's speech, which I will have something to say about in a few minutes.

It could not be more urgent that they are testifying. The COVID-19 pandemic has thrown over 35 million people into sudden unemployment, the highest level since the Great Depression. Chairman Powell has said that further lay-

offs can continue for months. The anguish that so many people feel. Without further action, Powell said, we risk "prolonged recession and weak recovery," with unemployment reaching 20 percent or even 25 percent. In Chairman Powell's words, it may be that Congress has to do more, and the reason we have to do more is to avoid longer damage to the economy. Those are Chairman Powell's words, a non-political appointee by President Trump.

Mr. Powell's testimony this morning, hopefully, will jolt my Republican colleagues into action, finally. At the very least, his testimony should awaken them from their slumber and compel some understanding of the scope and urgency of the problem at hand. Maybe his speech will somehow galvanize our Republican colleagues into coming forward and talking about COVID, doing oversight of COVID, and coming up with the kinds of plans that we saw in COVID 4.0 in the House that are so well needed. Maybe they will talk about things like this. Are they for aiding State and local governments? Are they for so many of the things in the bill—more help for hospitals, more help for testing, more money for PPE, more help for those who have lost their jobs, or are they not? All we hear is silence from our Republican colleagues.

I sat on the House and Senate Banking Committees for decades. I may hold the record for attendance at hearings with Fed Chairs, so I can state that Chairs of the Federal Reserve, whether appointed by Democratic or Republican Presidents, do not frivolously suggest that more congressional action is taken—rarely, do they do that. They try to avoid it. That is another reason why Chairman Powell's comments are so important. If he feels the need to push this Congress, and particularly this Republican Senate, to act, problems must be deep and real, and most Americans know it, but our Republican Senate colleagues don't seem to.

We are looking at an economic situation "without modern precedent" in Powell's words. We can either take action to soften the blow to businesses, families, workers, and average folks or, through inaction, prolong the recession and hamstring our Nation's recovery. Up until now, it seems our Republican colleagues are, unfortunately, choosing the latter: no immediate need for urgent action. Amazing. This is the greatest crisis America has faced in decades and decades.

Now my colleagues like to point out the costs of the House Democratic bill to provide another round of emergency relief. Republican leadership has taken time to assail parts of the Democratic bill that account for 0.0003 percent of the bill. They are not expected to like every single piece, but they are expected by the American people to act, and, mark my words, the American people will force them to act.

There are so many costs to inaction, and none other than the Republican-

appointed Chairman of the Federal Reserve is saying that those costs are likely greater than the costs of any relief bill. When will our Republican Senate colleagues start to get the message?

Looking at the floor of the U.S. Senate, you would never guess that we are in the middle of a national economic crisis. For 3 weeks, Leader MCCONNELL has not scheduled any legislative business related to the coronavirus. Senate Republican leadership is not even discussing their response to COVID-4 in the House.

Instead, this week, the Republican leader has scheduled five rightwing judges for the floor of the Senate. The Republican chairman of the Homeland Security Committee will hold a hearing tomorrow designed to slander the family of the President's political opponent, delving into a Kremlin-concocted conspiracy theory that has no truth and fell over like a dud in the impeachment hearing. Last night, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee announced that his committee will soon consider subpoenas relating to another conspiracy theory pushed by President Trump, this time to try and rewrite the history of Russian interference in the 2016 election to match the fantasy in President Trump's head. What does Leader MCCONNELL devote more of his floor remarks to today? That wild conspiracy theory aimed at somehow smearing the fine reputation that President Obama has well deserved. It is amazing that was the bulk of the speech.

Leader MCCONNELL, stop listening to President Trump and his wild theories and listen to the American people. We need action. We need action now. Every day, every week, and now almost every month we wait. The recession gets deeper and worse. More people are unemployed. More people lose their jobs, more small businesses are in jeopardy, and we are talking about some wild theory because President Trump demanded it, when everyone knows the President's penchant for truth is at a bare minimum, as exemplified by his hydroxychloroquine comments last night.

Wow. This is unbelievable. In the midst of historic unemployment and economic and health tragedy, Senate Republicans are using their majority to simply block and tackle for the President's reelection campaign. Senate Republicans are using their majority not to tackle the COVID crisis but to block and tackle for the President's reelection campaign. In the midst of a public health crisis, Senate Republicans are diving headfirst into the muck to smear the family—the family—of the President's political opponent.

It is such a gross misuse of the power of the majority. We were sent here to do the Nation's business. At the moment, that means helping our constituents through a time of immense challenge and hardship, but Senate Repub-

licans are using their committees to hold fishing expeditions dictated by the President's Twitter feed, which even his supporters don't usually believe.

If anyone doubts this is about politics; that this is about Senate Republicans doing the bidding of President Trump's personal political agenda, just remember what House Minority Leader MCCARTHY said before the last Presidential election. Leader MCCARTHY went on FOX News bragging that the Republicans put together a Benghazi select committee to bring Hillary Clinton's poll numbers down. Now Senate Republicans are using the same playbook to smear President Trump's political opponents once again. It will not work.

The American people know it is a crisis. They know the Republicans are doing nothing right now. They know that this is political folderol to please President Trump and will not solve America's problems. Rightfully, many Americans are just furious at Senate Republicans using their majority to pursue the President's political agenda in a time of national crisis.

The President is tweeting insane conspiracy theories, demanding that his water carriers on Capitol Hill make them look legitimate. Instead of focusing on testing capacity and policies to safely reopen our country to help so many individuals and businesses that are in need, the President is telling the press that he has taken an unproven treatment, hydroxychloroquine, for a disease he doesn't have. That is reckless.

Please, citizens of America, don't take hydroxychloroquine as a prevention for COVID, and medical experts have said it is not. Remember, it is risky. The FDA has said it has risks. This is a medicine that experts say, at best, may not be effective in treating or preventing COVID-19 and, at worst, causes serious heart problems in patients with certain conditions.

It is astonishingly reckless. I don't know why the President did it. Maybe he has family or friends who stand to benefit from the popularity of this drug. It wouldn't be unlike the President that someone called him who said it is a great drug, and he just talks about it. He has no penchant for research or science or even truth. It just pops into his head, and he thinks it sounds good. He thinks it is a diversion from his failures—which are so many—for dealing with COVID. He just says it. He doesn't care if it hurts people. He just says it. But I do know this. If the President was focused on testing or production of PPE or fashioning a careful plan to reopen the country instead of pushing quack medicines and inventing new conspiracies, the country would be in far better shape than it is today, and the country knows it.

The majority of Americans don't trust the President to handle this crisis, and Senate Republicans just say how high when he says jump, no matter how off base, false, or unrelated to COVID his theories are.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE DiSILVESTRO

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I would like to echo the kind words said by the majority leader about Mike DiSilvestro as he prepares to head into retirement on Friday after 37 years of service to the U.S. Senate.

Mike serves as director of the Office of Senate Security and is in charge of the secure facility here in the Capitol where Senators can receive classified briefings and review sensitive documents. There are very few individuals who have given as much time and attention to this institution as Mike with so little recognition or fanfare—such is the nature of the job—but on the cusp of his retirement, I hope he will allow us to pay him a few compliments.

Mike's counsel is wise. His word can be trusted implicitly. His focus is always on serving the institution, never on politics or party. His judgment and guidance have always been excellent, and he did not rely on subtlety. When you walk into the Senate's secure facility, you pass a World War II-era poster reminding you that "loose lips sink ships." His job has had many difficult responsibilities, and Mike was never more valuable or trusted than in difficult times.

He tracked down absent Senators on 9/11. He comforted terrified staff waiting to be decontaminated after ricin was discovered in Senator Frist's mailroom. During the anthrax incident, he donned a biohazard suit and entered the contaminated Hart building to retrieve vital documents from Senator Daschle's office. Even now, in the middle of a public health crisis, Mike has faithfully reported to duty to make sure this institution is able to complete its constitutional work.

I know he is finding this attention on the floor today uncomfortable. I don't know if he is still here. Yes, sorry for all the flattery, but it is well deserved. He is accustomed to working entirely outside the limelight. He will never be quoted in the paper, and I suspect he will never write a tell-all book about his time in the Senate, but for those of us here, Senators and staffers alike, we will long remember his sense of humor, his devotion to family, his work ethic, and his strong, principled leadership.

There are only a very few staffers who are both known and respected by every single Senator. Mike is one of the few. His absence will be felt by all of us.

Mike, I wish you well. I hope you finally get to play all the golf you want, complete the Appalachian Trail, and that you enjoy every day of your well-earned retirement. Congratulations.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING
BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior executive legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott H. Rash, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 579

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, some of you at home may be old enough to remember a distinct circular scar on your upper arm. You may remember a parent or grandparent who had one. That mark was probably one of the world's greatest public health successes—the eradication of the deadly smallpox virus. That so many alive today no longer remember the death and misery caused by this disease is a testament to global efforts in a cooperative manner.

The smallpox virus likely originated more than 3,000 years ago and was one of the most devastating diseases ever in the history of humanity. It was barely visible under the most powerful microscope and was known for fiery bumps covering the face and body, profuse internal bleeding, black vomit, and pieces of destroyed skin that would shed off one's body.

Smallpox is estimated to have killed up to 300 million people in the 20th century—300 million—and around 500 million in the last hundred years of its existence.

In 1967, the World Health Organization launched a historic, intense effort to eradicate smallpox. The global eradication effort initially used a strategy of mass vaccination to achieve 80 percent vaccine coverage in each country and, thereafter, used contact tracing—familiar with the word?—to reduce and rein in additional outbreaks.

Ultimately, the global eradication of smallpox was certified and endorsed in 1980, making it one of the most successful collaborative public health initiatives in the history of the world. In fact, this month marks the 40th anniversary of the World Health Organization's historic achievement: the end of smallpox.

Similar global efforts have been taken to deal with diseases such as polio and Ebola. So imagine my concern and that of the rest of the world that, amid the devastating global coronavirus pandemic, the United States decided just recently to sit out a conference to collaborate and raise

funds to research, manufacture, and distribute a possible coronavirus treatment and vaccine.

Just as with the smallpox effort, such a global collaborative approach makes sense, being both morally and strategically the thing to do to save lives around the world. You see, joining forces with other countries would help speed up the development and eventual distribution of a coronavirus vaccine that we all desperately seek. It would save lives in America, but it would also save lives around the world.

No one knows—no one knows—where the vaccine will eventually be perfected or produced, so we should be on this. The United States should be at the table. We should be part of the collective global effort to find this vaccine.

Clearly, other world leaders get it. They understand the obvious imperative of raising \$8 billion to be spent over the next 2 years. Eight billion dollars is a massive sum of money until you place it up against the price we are currently paying for this virus.

Our allies in the European Union and Norway came to this table that the United States vacated, or refused to attend, and each pledged \$1 billion toward this \$8 billion goal.

Who was absent from this critical effort to save lives around the world, including lives in the United States? Sadly, it was the United States itself. We were not part of this virtual global conference. You see, again, another short-sighted and critically missed opportunity to address the coronavirus, a question about what this administration was thinking. Why were we missing in action when all of these countries came together?

I don't know where this vaccine will be found. It will be a great source of pride if it is in the United States. I have the greatest confidence in the men and women who are researchers and the businesses prepared to produce and develop it. I have the greatest confidence in them. But what if the very safest vaccine, the most effective vaccine, the one that is proven to be the best comes instead from England or Germany? Does that mean we will not use it because it is not the American vaccine? We know better than that. We want the safest, most effective vaccine, wherever it may come from, to be available to the world and, certainly, to the United States of America.

Supporters in Congress said little or nothing when it came to the decision to vacate and to not be present at this international conference. The President has blamed others for problems that we face today, but it was his decision not to participate in this global conference on the vaccine. It could have devastating consequences.

So what does it mean for America? Well, we continue to have some of the world's best researchers: experts at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and many universities and private

researchers that work across the country and around the world. Many NIH-funded researchers have spent years studying coronaviruses. Their knowledge could help to pave the way for future breakthroughs.

I applaud them, and I have to tell you, for the last 4 or 5 years there has been a quartet of Senators of both political parties who have given dramatic investments to the National Institutes of Health for additional research. We have been led by ROY BLUNT, the Republican chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as LAMAR ALEXANDER, the Republican chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. PATTY MURRAY has always been at the forefront of this effort, and I have done my best to back them up every way possible.

We have had a 30-percent or more increase over the last 4 years in research at the NIH, so I believe in the NIH, and I have made it a major part of the job that I have undertaken here in the U.S. Senate with my bipartisan colleagues.

Clinical trials, we know, are underway at NIH for vaccines. I want to commend that agency; Dr. Fauci, a friend of more than 20 years; and Dr. Collins, the same, for their tireless, unwavering, and inspired effort. But it is plausible, as I mentioned earlier, that the best vaccine candidate may turn up in some other country, not in the United States; that it will be some overseas company that decides to initiate and lead the production of the vaccine.

In a rush to research and validate a vaccine, ramp up production, and address global allocation and supply needs that would ensure affordability and access worldwide, where will the United States stand: in the fray, in the battle, or on the sidelines?

Last week we decided to stay on the sidelines and not to work with global partners to find this vaccine. When the United States pursues a go-it-alone approach while the rest of the world is working together, where does that leave us? That is why last week Senators Schumer, Murray, Leahy, Menendez, Murphy, Duckworth, and nearly three dozen others joined me in introducing a straightforward resolution that calls on the United States to join these global efforts.

I am grateful to organizations like PATH, Shot@Life, Better World Campaign, and the UN Association of the United States for their support of this resolution as well. Quite simply, we should be part of these efforts to not only offer American expertise but to share in lifesaving benefits.

We used to have a profound, well documented, proud bipartisan history of such effort. For example, I was pleased to rally around President Bush's call to stem the scourge of AIDS around the world through the historic PEPFAR Program. Many of my Republican colleagues in the Senate supported these efforts.

Now we face this coronavirus outbreak. I was equally proud of President

Obama's efforts to set up infectious disease prevention systems and his leadership on the Ebola crisis.

I have been told that one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is going to object to enacting this resolution this morning. I wanted to read the resolution clause that this colleague will be objecting to. I want those who are following this debate to ask whether they find this objectionable.

Here is what it says: "... calls on the United States Government to boost funding for and strengthen collaboration with key multilateral institutions at the forefront of responding to COVID-19, such as the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations; Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance; and the Solidarity Trial."

This is not a radical or partisan suggestion. We did our best to make it nonpartisan because it should be. Does anyone in this country care if the researcher who finds that vaccine is a Republican or a Democrat? I certainly don't. We shouldn't care, either, whether it is found in the United States or another country. I would be so proud if it is found here, but if there is a safe and effective vaccine found in another country, we certainly want to participate in its discovery, its production, and its distribution. To stay on the sidelines at that point in history would be disastrous.

Last Friday I was driving from Chicago to Springfield. It is about a 3-hour and 15-minute ride. I had plenty of time in that rental car to listen to a lot of radio, but it was interrupted—interrupted by the President who, in a press conference, made it clear to us that he was going to address the need for this global vaccine, as he said, at warp speed.

I have disagreed with this President on a lot of things, but I sure don't disagree with that statement. The sooner we can find it, the better, and I want the United States to use all of its resources to make it happen.

The President was asked in a press conference afterward what that meant in terms of sharing this vaccine with the world, and he said, "We'll do it." It was a simple statement. There was no reservation. He made a pledge right then and there that, if we discover this vaccine, it will be shared with the world. Thank you, Mr. President. That was the right thing to say, at the right moment, as the whole world was watching to see the United States' leadership.

What I am calling on in this resolution is simply that we use our expertise and an investment—and we make investments every day in global efforts—that we use this for a collaborative effort, a global effort, to find this vaccine. As I have said from the beginning, it will be a great source of pride if it is found here, but if it isn't, if there is a safer or effective vaccine that is available and it is discovered in another country, what difference does it make, if it saves lives in America and around the world.

Let's be part of this effort. Let's set our pride aside and, instead, talk about the impact it would have on the people today who are in fear, suffering and, sadly, dying as a result of this global virus.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 579 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RISCH. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, reserving the right to object, let me state the resolution referred to by my friend from Illinois is comfortably residing in the Foreign Relations Committee at the present time and is subject to the regular order of Congress and of the committee.

There is almost nothing that the Senator said that I disagree with, although from time to time I do disagree with my good friend and colleague from Illinois.

I think that this is a matter of most consequence to the United States of America today, and certainly the pursuit of a vaccine and/or a cure are of utmost importance. I think that the process by which we go through that is incredibly important.

Like the Senator from Illinois, I am a huge fan of the NIH and, for that matter, the CDC, which do great things for the public health system in not only America but in the world. They are vastly underappreciated. They are much like the electric switch in our rooms. Every morning, we get up and turn on the electricity and everything is fine, and we just take it for granted and don't even think about it. That is true of the NIH and the CDC. They do good work regardless of whether we are thinking about it.

In America, we have something more than just a government effort when it comes to public health. We have this great machine called the free market and free enterprise system that incentivizes Americans, through the private sector, to do great and glorious things.

Indeed, while my good friend from Illinois was bragging on the efforts by other countries to pursue the kinds of things that are needed, within the last 24 hours we have had a very important announcement from part of our private sector, which is making great strides in this regard.

I think it is important that we do accept that there are various ways that we can and should pursue the vaccine and the cure for this horrible scourge. This matter is a lot deeper than that. It is the intent of our committee to

hold hearings and develop very comprehensive legislation regarding how we pursue this in the future. What has just recently happened to us is of great interest to all of us but not nearly as important as what is going to happen to us in the future.

There are parts of S. Res. 579, if not the vast majority of it, that I hope will be included when we get to what, hopefully, will be a comprehensive piece of bipartisan legislation to address this. Some of the whereases I am not too red-hot about, but as far as the resolutions are concerned, certainly, they state things that there would be unanimity, I think, in agreement.

Where are we going with this? What my friend from Illinois has raised is a very small facet—an important facet but a small facet—of what we are going to do, what is the intent of our committee to do, going forward in what I think will be a bipartisan fashion. Again, like I said, I hope we are able to include these. I welcome the Senator's participation and all Members of the Senate's participation as the Foreign Relations Committee does move forward on some comprehensive legislation.

What do we know for sure right now? I think Senator DURBIN did an excellent job of taking us through history when it comes to some of the things we have had in the past like smallpox, AIDS, polio, and Ebola. And, certainly, the United States has been a leader and will be a leader on this particular scourge.

The WHO—and, for that matter, other world organizations—have been large players, important players, helpful players in those efforts in the past on smallpox, AIDS, polio, and Ebola. Again, I come back to, just as an example, polio. A huge factor in that was not the U.S. Government involvement—well, it was a huge factor, but another huge player in that were private citizens, a couple in the United States, Bill and Melinda Gates, who played a huge role in eradicating polio, working with the WHO, working with the USG, and many others.

I have no doubt, as we go forward on this, there will be that type of collaboration in the future. As the good Senator noted, this is not a political issue. This is not a Democratic issue. It is not a Republican issue. The virus doesn't care who you are or what you are. It is just looking for a home. We need to deny it that home, and we will. I think we will make great strides as we go forward.

What do we know for sure right now? What we know is that this particular virus evolved in China, particularly in Wuhan Province, and specifically in a species of bat.

What we also know is that there are about 2,000, so far, identified viruses that are in the same position that are carried by bats in the Wuhan Province. What we also know is that a virus has escaped from China before. There is a lot of speculation as to exactly how

this happened. We know that the virus jumped species, from the bat to a human being and then went around the world.

We also know, for a fact, that this particular virus, like all viruses, acts uniquely. It is not exactly the same as other viruses that have jumped species and gone around the world. This one was unique in that, unlike some of the ones we have had in the past—this is our sixth experience since 2003 with the virus—this moved around the world at an incredibly fast speed. It was much more like a house on fire than the other diseases that we have talked about, like smallpox or polio. Its speed was unique. It was new. It was different.

As a result of that, historical organizations that have dealt with these in the past were not expecting it and were not geared for it. They thought this virus would move much like the others that we have dealt with. The result of that, of course, was that it got away from us, from the world, and we now find ourselves in the position we are in because that happened.

It is my hope, and it is my objective—and hopefully will be the objective of our committee, eventually the objective of the U.S. Senate, and hopefully eventually the objective of the world—that we develop a protocol for dealing with a virus or, for that matter, any other health challenge that moves at the speed of light and like a house on fire as opposed to a small, creeping thing that we have had in the past in some of the other challenges we have had.

It is different. There is no doubt it is different. It is going to have to be dealt with differently, and we are going to have to develop a protocol that does address this speed. It is going to entail—and this is probably the heaviest lift of all of it we are going to do—the 200 governments around the world to come together and agree that when something like this happens in their country, instead of covering it up or instead of making political excuses, or instead of hoping it is going to go away, that instead they call the fire department. And the fire department will be a new agency or perhaps even one of the old agencies that we have had that are geared to handle a pandemic that moves at this speed or presents other challenges.

The institutions we have simply aren't geared to do that, which we found out with this epidemic. I think a good example is, as my good friend from Illinois mentioned, the Ebola challenge we had. The historical institutions, I think, dealt quickly with that and really held down the damage from it, which could have been much worse than what it was. We need to develop protocols for dealing with this.

This is going to be a challenge. There is no question it is going to be a challenge because politics comes into this simply because of governments in the various 200 countries around the world

have to deal with this. When they do deal with it, they have different ways of dealing with it.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I deal with our diplomats who deal with the diplomats from other countries. We deal with them on the committee directly, but since this thing has hit, we haven't had as much direct contact, but our diplomats have continued to have contact. In talking with them, one of the things I find particularly disturbing is, I ask: Are the Chinese humble about this? How are they dealing with this? What is their view of what has happened here? Interestingly enough, they take it as an opportunity to compare our form of government to their form of government. And they say: Look, we had a problem; we dealt with it. You guys had the same problem, and you dealt with it. And the reason is because we have this strong authoritarian central government that can control people and can control people in the most severe fashion, and we can deal with it. You people, with all these freedoms and your democracies, you have speech, you have these political arguments, you have these disagreements, and you allow dissent, and when you have that, you can't deal with it. Therefore, our form of government is better than your form of government. That is very dangerous talk.

I am disturbed and disappointed the Chinese Government has viewed this as they have and has not viewed it as we have, as a challenge that is going to take historical changes as we go forward. That is a huge challenge as we go forward, but that shouldn't stop us from making every effort that we can to go forward, and we will.

On the Foreign Relations Committee, it is our intent to hold hearings to deliberate, as the U.S. Senate does, and to produce what hopefully will be a bipartisan piece of legislation, which is substantially broader than what we have here, but hopefully that will include many of the things that we have here, and that will include—as the good Senator from Illinois has indicated—the necessity of including other governments in the effort as we go forward.

I commit to Senator DURBIN, and I commit to all that our committee will undertake this challenge. It is within the jurisdiction and the responsibility of our committee. We take it seriously. We are still in the throes of this, although it feels like we are on the downhill side and are starting to come out of this. As we go forward in a very commonsense, deliberative fashion, we hope to construct legislation that will address all of these very serious issues.

If there is one thing we know for sure—and I am absolutely convinced of it—this is going to happen again. Given the physical situation on the ground in Wuhan, China, and given the fact that there are 2,000 other viruses, probably some of which are substantially worse than this—and, for that matter, the

same situation in other parts of the world—this is going to happen again. Given the population of the world and given the culture of the way we live today in the world and our travel and interconnectedness, this is going to happen again.

We need to be ready for it. We need strong legislation that will address this, not only at the U.S. level but also at the international level. The United States has been the world leader in world health issues, and I anticipate that we will continue to be like that. At the present time, it is under consideration in our committee. At the present time, we can't go forward with this.

Before I state an objection, I want to yield to my good friend from Indiana, who also has some ideas in this regard, and all of which will be, I am sure, constructive on both sides of the aisle. I want to yield the floor to Senator BRAUN at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). Is there an objection?

Mr. RISCH. Not yet.

I want to yield to Senator BRAUN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 658

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I object, but my colleague from Illinois is not wrong. I think after I get through explaining my objection, hopefully, there will be something we can work out.

The United States should be engaging more in global efforts to find treatments and vaccines for coronavirus. Governments, academic institutions, scientists, researchers across the world are racing to do it. The United States must work at home and with international partners to develop treatments and vaccines. There is no reason we can't be doing something on our own and working with others across the world.

This is a joint venture, if there ever has been one. However, the nonbinding resolution that my colleague has offered is not an actual solution. I come from the world—and one of the frustrations for being here for just a year and a half is that we don't get more stuff across the finish line. I have a real solution to ensure Americans benefit from the vaccine and treatment development efforts happening across the world. My bill, the ADAPT Act, S. 658, as amended, would create an expedited, almost automatic approval process at the FDA for vaccines and treatments that might occur across the world. We do not have the market cornered on good ideas.

These countries have all developed regulatory systems that are compatible and that should make us feel comfortable. But instead of just talking about it, which we do so much of here, this bill would actually establish the approval reciprocity for treatments and vaccines between the FDA and other trusted counterparts.

If one of them approves a vaccine or treatment, they are quickly, almost automatically, approved here in the United States with my bill. We cannot afford miscommunication or bureaucratic foot-dragging with something so important. My bill ensures that regulators will work proactively to get Americans a vaccine as soon as possible.

Look at the early testing missteps we did have with the CDC. I mentioned that in the briefing last Tuesday. Their overly proscriptive approach delayed our testing capability for the first 40 days. The result has been a one-size-fits-all approach of locking down the economy, which I think we will see some of the disadvantages of that over the next few months.

When my staff talked with the FDA about working with international partners on treatment and vaccine development, the FDA assured them that they have everything under control and are speaking with their international counterparts. The FDA assured my staff that they have covered the issues that might come into play when you are having a partnership with somebody else. The FDA is promoting the idea and having the doors open for developers to submit data and to seek approval for treatments and vaccines.

Until we have a vaccine, reopening will be gradual. We need herd immunity and vaccines to be the final solution to this saga we are going through, but we cannot afford bureaucratic obstacles slowing down regulatory approvals for a successful vaccine.

As we have seen, certain steps of vaccine development can be achieved at warp speed to cut down on development time, but regulatory approvals will not be one of them unless we take legislative action.

The ADAPT Act is real action, not just talk, specifically designed for times like this when scientists across the world are racing to develop treatments and vaccines.

Therefore, with my prior objection, I do not want to leave my friend from Illinois emptyhanded.

Madam President, in hoping my colleague from Illinois will not object, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 658 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the Braun substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. First, let me say to my friend and colleague from Idaho, thank you. The tone of your remarks are

positive, constructive, bipartisan. That is exactly what the American people are looking for, at least in Illinois, and I will bet you in Idaho as well.

This national emergency, this public health crisis, should bring out the best in us and not the most political side of our nature. Thank you because I think your remarks were offered in that respect.

We have been here now 3 weeks. This is the third week since returning from a break where most of us were at home. I think this is the longest period of debate on the coronavirus we have witnessed on the floor of the Senate in 3 weeks.

I thought this 3-week period would be all about COVID-19, all about the vaccine. It hasn't. We have taken up many other things that have nothing to do with it. What we have talked about here this morning is encouraging to me. If bringing this resolution up with a unanimous consent request is going to lead to the Senate Foreign Relations and other committees moving forward on important policy questions that you raised, and I hope I raised as well, then it was not time wasted. It was time well spent.

We do agree on so much more than we disagree, I am sure of it, when it comes to this. I invite you, I encourage you, I beg you, as soon as we return from next week's recess, the sooner we can bring a hearing before your committee and others the better.

I would like to address the unanimous consent request of my colleague from Indiana as well.

It has been my good fortune in the House and Senate to work with the Food and Drug Administration. It is probably one of the most underrated agencies of our Federal Government. They make decisions, literally, life-and-death decisions, every single day of things unimaginable to us. It is hard to look at all of the things they regulate and inspect and not be impressed. I have been impressed over the years with the Food and Drug Administration. But the gold standard of the Food and Drug Administration, which was established at least 60 years ago with the Thalidomide scandal, was that this agency was to take a look at drugs that were about to go on the market in America and conduct tests, ask questions, do their own research to determine two things: Are they safe, and are they effective? Safe and effective. That is it. But it is a lot.

Over the years, for 60 years or more, they have used this standard to judge drugs, clinical trials, which carefully measure the impacts of a drug on the human body over a period of time and the like. It is frustrating because, at times, it takes longer than we wish. There are exceptions that have been created at the Food and Drug Administration for extraordinary circumstances wherein it can accelerate the process, but by and large, it has to judge drugs as being safe and effective.

Nearly three-quarters of drugs today are approved in the United States by

the Food and Drug Administration before they are approved in any other country around the world. The FDA is considered the gold standard. I have been told that so many times. Many countries look to the Food and Drug Administration in the United States to see if it has approved of a drug's being safe and effective before they move forward. This demonstrates that the Food and Drug Administration has an awesome responsibility but is doing a good job in ensuring Americans have timely access to the same drugs as have patients in other countries.

The ADAPT Act, which Senator BRAUN brings to the floor, is a solution, I believe, in search of a problem. Sadly, it runs a real risk. This notion that we are somehow going to open up the possibility of a drug's having been approved in another country being approved in the United States quickly, without any review, I think is a dangerous thing to do.

To date, we know what the coronavirus has done to us, and we also know that this bill would completely change how drugs would be approved for sale in the United States of America. It is not a minor bill. It is a major change. Under current law, if a pharmaceutical company wants to sell a drug, it needs the approval of the FDA. It tests it to be sure it is safe and effective. It is the gold standard.

The Senator's proposal would abolish this method. That is significant. Instead, the Senator's proposal says, if a drug has been approved by another developed country—I am not sure of his definition of a "developed country"—it can bypass standard U.S. regulation and come to market without going through the Food and Drug Administration's study, review, and approval.

It is worth noting that many Members of the House and Senate have criticized the pharmaceutical industry for charging Americans the highest drug prices in the world. I have been in that chorus from time to time and have suggested that drug prices in the United States should be the same as they are in Canada and Europe for the same drugs. Many times, people on the Senator's side of the aisle have resisted that suggestion. They have called it socialism and have said we shouldn't let other countries dictate what America has to pay for drugs. Yet, now, apparently, Senator BRAUN is comfortable with letting other countries dictate whether our drugs are safe and effective.

This bill is not a targeted response to the coronavirus; it is an open-ended giveaway to some pharmaceutical operation. More importantly, it is putting our safety at risk in America, which we never ever want to do. Instead of approving the resolution I introduced that simply expresses the support for global coordination, Senator BRAUN wants to completely overturn our Nation's drug approval process.

This bill was introduced more than a year ago. It is still in search of a cosponsor, and it hasn't been consented

by the Republican Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, which oversees the FDA. Now is the time for the best and the brightest from all nations to work together toward the shared goal of ending this pandemic and finding a safe and effective vaccine. It is not the time to completely upend our Nation's drug approval process to make it easy for some countries to flood our market with unsafe and ineffective drugs.

For these reasons, I object to Senator BRAUN's counterproposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard for both unanimous consent requests.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, this may be a rare moment of some collegiality on the idea in general. I think the American public and, especially, I, who is one who has watched this place operate for so many years in my leading up to the point when I ran for the Senate, accept the kind of guidance that there may need to be more fleshed out, and the Senator objected to it.

Yet I think the American public deserves action out of this place, and so often it seems we dawdle and do not get to the point. Look at how long it took the body to come to an agreement on criminal justice reform. One of the first questions I asked when I got here was, How long have you been working on it? The answer—10 to 12 years. When you look at what we do get accomplished here, I think we need to figure out how we become more effective, how we get things done more quickly, and how we pay for it in the long run.

So I am going to savor the moment we have here. We are at least talking about it. Hopefully, we will be able to work with my neighbor from Illinois to still push the idea that this is a critical time and that we need to get something done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I believe there is a unanimous consent request pending. Has there been an objection to my original unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objections were heard to both unanimous consent requests.

The Senator from North Carolina.

REMEMBERING TOM COBURN

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I think divine intervention has played a part here with this exchange and the comments of my colleagues because I am here to pay tribute to my good friend Tom Coburn, who, on March 28, passed away—our colleague and, more importantly, a dear friend. I almost sat in the cloakroom and then came out here, thinking this could be a conversation that Dr. Coburn could be having on the Senate floor about the need to accomplish things, to think outside the box. Yet, as my good friend from Illinois said, don't destroy the gold standard

that is there; find a way to work within it. Dr. Coburn had a lifetime of doing that.

To pay tribute to a friend and a colleague, I actually have to rewind 26 years, when both Tom Coburn and I came to the House of Representatives in a large class. It was alphabetical, so you can see how "B" and "C" would be close and how Chambliss would be a friend and Latham. We were a cadre of folks who really sized up very quickly whom it could trust.

To understand Tom Coburn is to understand that this was a guy with an incredibly diverse background in that he ran a medical device company, in that he was an OB/GYN, in that he experienced things in life and, in my case, was a little bit older. To understand Tom Coburn is to remember the commercial wherein the bull went into the china store, and no matter which way it turned, it was always going to break something. Tom believed that you had to break something to understand whether it was important or whether it was just clutter.

I think, like every new Member of Congress, you come in with a belief that you are going to change the world but have no idea how to do it, and you find that people who have been there for their careers hold all of the cards, and that is the knowledge of how that legislation was crafted and why it was done. To understand Tom Coburn is to realize that this didn't scare him. Tom knew a lot, and when he hit things he didn't know, he sounded like he did; therefore, people were scared to take him on.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, on which we both served, Tom was incredibly instrumental in healthcare policy, in medical device issues. Tom was a practicing OB/GYN when he got to the House and then, later on, when he got to the Senate, and he never could understand why he could not go back to Oklahoma on the weekends and deliver babies. Now, this is a man who had delivered tens of thousands of babies over his career in Oklahoma, but the way the Senate rules are—they are so antiquated—you couldn't go home and keep up your license to deliver babies because you could not earn money. Tom challenged that when he was in the U.S. Senate. He challenged that antiquated rule, and he lost.

So, as I sat and listened to this debate that was about healthcare, I could only sit there and think about the argument that Tom Coburn had made about this antiquated rule that what you came in with and practiced in civilian life you had to throw overboard here. You could no longer do it. Tom decided he would go back on the weekends and deliver babies. Yet, rather than have them make payments to him, they would make payments to nonprofit organizations in his hometown of Tulsa, and they would make them commensurate as to what they could afford.

So, for a guy who was perceived as the right of the right hard-liner, Tom was probably one of the most compassionate individuals. He was one of the individuals who understood the common person, because, in his mind, he was one his entire life—one who was never privileged, who earned everything he got, and who banked everything he learned. Ultimately, at the end of his career, he used that for this institution, for the American people, and for people around the world.

Early on, I remember Tom and my sitting down with John Dingell, the former Democratic chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee. John Dingell, who was a great man and whom Tom and I both liked a lot, either wrote every bill that came out of the Energy and Commerce Committee or his dad did before him for, probably, 60 years. John had an inherent advantage every time we argued legislation because he either wrote it or his dad wrote it. He knew why he did it, and he knew why they structured it the way they did. I think John recognized something in Tom—that here was a guy who could bring fresh life to it.

At the time, I remember Chairman Dingell sitting us down and saying: Guys, spend a year listening, not a year talking.

Well, that was easy for me to do because I didn't know a whole lot when I got here, but that was the toughest thing Tom Coburn was ever faced with was to be silent because he really came in and wanted to change the world in short order.

When he got there, Tom said: I will only be here for 6 years.

He accomplished a tremendous amount. His imprint is felt by the people in the House today. You might remember he was probably the loudest voice for government waste—for the size of what we spent, for how much we took from the American people, and for what bad stewards we were of how we used it and spent it. I think Tom left with peace from the House of Representatives because, for the first time in our lifetimes, the budget was balanced.

None of us anticipated what would happen in 2000 and the effects of 9/11, and nobody was more shocked than I, in the same year I came from the House to the Senate, to see Tom Coburn run as a Senate candidate for the State of Oklahoma. Tom came in with the same belief that we needed to change things and that we needed to do it quickly. Tom served on the House Intelligence Committee. When he got to the U.S. Senate and served on the Senate Intelligence Committee, Tom understood much better the challenges with which we were faced. I will not say that his approach changed but that Tom assessed what was possible and never went for what was impossible.

There are Senators in this Chamber who haven't had the good fortune to serve with a Tom Coburn, who haven't been influenced and educated by some

of the things Tom Coburn impacted many of us with—those of us who spent our entire careers with him. Yet the American people will feel the benefits of Tom Coburn's education here, his imprint on this institution.

JAMES LANKFORD, the Senator from Oklahoma, picked up his "Pig Book" that he put out every year, which is a list of those insane expenditures that Tom Coburn used to come up with on an annual basis to make us all feel shameful about the appropriations process. Thank goodness Tom Coburn did that because JAMES LANKFORD still does it today on an annual basis.

I probably can't point to anything more important than healthcare to tell you how Tom's impact on this institution has been felt, and I think it will be felt for years to come. Tom and I believed that there was a different direction, not because we were smart but because the one we were on didn't work.

I remember sitting down with Dr. Coburn, and he said: We are going to change the healthcare architecture.

I said: Tom, you have been doing this for a long time. What architecture works?

He said: Well, we are going to have to try them all, and when we find one that doesn't fail, we will know that one is right.

When he got to that point, without hesitation, Tom came to the Senate floor and talked about the Patients' Choice Act over and over and over again. In the 3 or 4 years since Tom has been gone from the institution, the debate has shifted. In fact, where Tom Coburn was and where he tried to tell our colleagues we needed to settle—in empowering patients and bringing transparency to healthcare—is something we struggle with today.

There was no bigger advocate for transparency in healthcare costs than Tom Coburn, and when the administration tried to administer that this year, hospitals went to court and won—meaning, they don't have to publish pricing. To the average person, that makes no sense. For those of us who had been on the frontline with Tom Coburn, finally, an administration had done it only to see it overruled. Yet, even on the day he died, it was one of the key things that Tom believed—that transparency was absolutely essential in the healthcare process.

I can remember Tom was not new to cancer. I think he fought cancer four or five times. One day, during his most recent battle, we were coming up on the Christmas holiday, I remember, and I think he was in his chemotherapy treatment. He was still in the U.S. Senate, and Tom was exhausted at the time. In between votes, he would go to the cloakroom and lie down on the couch. Everybody knew he didn't feel well. When he would get up to vote, we would look at the pillow. It looked like a cat had been on it as Tom's hair would stay on the pillow. Now, he never lost it all, but we understood the

challenges he was going through in his own personal life that he never expressed with any of his colleagues or friends.

I have never seen a person who battled as peacefully as did Tom Coburn. His impact will be felt for generations to come, not just here but by the kids he delivered in Oklahoma, who today are 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 years old—kids who will grow up reading about their hero from Oklahoma.

Though Tom had a distinguished congressional career and will be remembered for a lot of legislative victories, that is not Tom Coburn's greatest claim to fame. I have never known an individual more devoted to a wife than Tom Coburn was to Carolyn. She was a beauty queen. She was when she was young, and she was, in Tom's eyes, on the day he died. He loved her without question. Tom also loved his daughters. He was so proud of their accomplishments. He and Carolyn worked to make sure they finally moved so they had everybody close. I think Tom knew that the wheel of luck was going to run out. Yet, you see, that is not the way Tom looked at it. He wanted to spend every precious moment with his wife, his kids, and his grandchildren. He wanted any impact and impression he could make to be on that next generation of Coburns.

For all of the qualities in Tom Coburn that I could talk about, there is not enough time to really praise him. It would take days, and it would take many individuals to come up and do it. It is probably impossible to say goodbye to a friend like Tom Coburn. To me, there is no question that I came to trust and value everything that Tom stood for.

The one thing about Tom Coburn that many people knew was that Tom had this tremendous peace about himself. I think some might have thought it was because Tom had had such a stellar background and had known so much. The truth is, if you had sat and talked to Tom, you would have found out the truth. Tom loved his Lord Jesus Christ. He didn't hide it. When given the opportunity, he wanted to share that peace with anybody who was willing to sit and listen. Tom was criticized for where he lived because it was certainly religious in leaning, but that was Tom's life. As much as he adored his wife and children and grandchildren, he adored his Lord just as much.

My colleagues were blessed to have Tom Coburn's influence on this institution. Not everybody in America understands how blessed they are to have had his influence on the policies and the way future generations will be impacted by Tom Coburn for all of his works. Today Tom may be in Heaven—no, today Tom is in Heaven, and I would bet my colleagues that he is giving them hell. He is up there trying to change the architecture of the deck chairs. He is up trying to say: Why do we do things this way and not that way?

One of the things that used to bug Tom about this institution is he couldn't figure out why we had telephones in the U.S. Senate that looked as though they were created in 1950. You might remember, about 5 or 6 years ago, the Senate got new phones. They still will not redial from the last number you called, and they still look like they are from the Soviet era of the 1950s, but that is the way the U.S. Senate is, and that is what Tom was trying to change. In many aspects he may not have changed the telephone, but he changed the institution. He changed the way we look at it.

Although he may be challenging the rules in Heaven today, make no mistake about him, he is still preaching the Word and he has always believed that Word. For all of the things Tom Coburn tried to accomplish, he did it in a way that his Lord would have been proud of him.

My colleagues, I know others will pay tribute to Tom Coburn's work here. I am here today to pay tribute to Tom Coburn's life, not just the impact he had on this institution or the Congress of the United States as a whole but the example he set for all of us that life doesn't have to be fair. But we as individuals have to be committed, and Tom Coburn was committed to everything in life that he did. I am sure today Tom continues to preach commitment to those who will listen.

With that, I honor his passing, and I say this to him in the spirit that it is meant. Several days after we got word that he had passed, I said to my wife: With COVID-19 and Congress dislocated, what would Tom Coburn have done? She looked at me and she said: He would have grown a beard.

We all remember those days when, all of a sudden, he would show up, and the beard was grown, and he would say: Until this is over, I am not going to shave. And that day I decided not to shave.

I was going to give this tribute to Tom Coburn last week. The events of last week didn't permit me to come do that tribute, and I couldn't make it through this week until I got home and shaved because it was the most aggravating thing that I have ever had, and I understood why in 64 years I hadn't grown any facial hair. I proved that I could do it because I was honoring my friend.

I hope that others in this institution will look on Tom Coburn's contributions in the same way I do, as a very special exposure that we all had.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, as we continue our work here in the Senate, COVID-19 continues to be at the top of

our agenda. We are monitoring implementation of the \$2.4 trillion of the coronavirus funding that we provided, and we are talking to experts about what is needed to help our country reopen. Our committees, where so much of our key legislative work is done, have held a number of coronavirus hearings over the past 2 weeks, and there are more on the agenda.

This week, the Committee on Aging will hold a hearing on caring for seniors during the coronavirus crisis. The Senate Banking Committee will hold a hearing with Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin and Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell to discuss implementation of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act—the CARES Act—which was our largest coronavirus relief bill.

The Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee will hold a hearing to consider the nomination of Brian D. Miller to be special inspector general for pandemic recovery at the Treasury Department. With just an ounce of cooperation from Democrats, we could confirm this important watchdog yet this week.

Finally, the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, will be in executive session to consider legislation and nominations, including two coronavirus bills.

Of course, while coronavirus remains our top priority, we are also focused on doing the other business the American people expect us to do, from funding our government to protecting our Nation. Last week, the Senate voted to reauthorize three expired provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that provide essential tools to our law enforcement and intelligence communities, as well as a number of reforms to strengthen privacy protections and guard against abuses.

We have also been considering nominations for key administration posts, including Director of National Intelligence and Secretary of the Navy. This week, we expect to confirm a nominee to reestablish a quorum at the Federal Election Commission, as well as a number of nominees to fill vacancies on Federal district courts.

So that is what the Senate has been doing. What has the House of Representatives been up to? Well, until last Friday, the answer was not much. But on Friday, the House brought its Members back to Washington to vote on a massive, \$3 trillion piece of legislation the Democratic leaders billed as coronavirus relief. In reality, as one House Democrat pointed out, the legislation is nothing more than a mesaging bill—that from a House Democrat.

Under the guise of coronavirus relief, House leaders put together a massive package of liberal priorities that they well knew would be dead on arrival here in the U.S. Senate. How unserious is their bill? Well, the Democrats' legislation mentions the word "cannabis"—"cannabis"—more often than the word "jobs."

Let me repeat that. House Democrats' legislation mentions the word "cannabis" more often than the word "jobs."

In case Democrats didn't realize, Americans are not suffering from lack of cannabis right now. They are suffering from a lack of employment.

Let me mention some other highlights of the Democrats' legislation: a tax cut for millionaires and billionaires; stimulus checks for illegal immigrants and deadbeat dads; environmental justice grants to study pollution; significant changes to election law—that is really related to the coronavirus—a ban on sharing information about lower cost health insurance options; and more. I could go on. The list literally goes on and on.

Unfortunately, while Democrats were focused on federalizing election law and requiring studies on diversity in the cannabis industry, they forgot about a few basics. Their bill does not include any meaningful plan to get Americans back to work. It provides hardly any relief or support for small businesses. It doesn't touch the issue of liability reform—even though preventing frivolous coronavirus lawsuits will be key to getting our economy going again—and it doesn't do anything to hold China accountable. The Democrats' bill is a fundamentally unserious bill at an incredibly serious time.

Democratic leaders knew from the beginning that there was no chance of this legislation getting through the Senate or being signed by the President. In fact, Democrats had some work to do to persuade members of their own caucus to vote for the bill. As POLITICO put it, "As of late Thursday evening, the House Democratic leadership was engaged in what a few senior aides and lawmakers described as the most difficult arm-twisting of the entire Congress: convincing their rank and file to vote for a \$3 trillion stimulus bill that will never become law."

Unfortunately, Democratic leaders were successful in their arm-twisting, and the bill did pass the House, albeit with some Democratic defections.

I have talked about the liberal wish list in this bill, but I haven't mentioned the other aspect of this proposal, and that is the enormous pricetag, a portion of which, of course, wouldn't even go to anything coronavirus-related. My friends across the aisle think that all problems can be solved with more money or a new government program, but they can't. And spending too much money can actually hurt rather than help Americans.

So far, we have spent \$2.4 trillion to fight the coronavirus. That is a tremendous amount of money, but these are extraordinary circumstances, and they call for an extraordinary response. We may very well have to spend more before this pandemic is over, and if we need to, we will. But we have an absolute obligation to make

sure we are spending only what is needed.

Every dollar we have spent so far on this pandemic is borrowed money—every single dollar. It is money we needed to borrow, and we were glad to do it, but we do need to remember that it is borrowed money, and the younger workers and our children and grandchildren are going to be paying for it. We have an obligation to them to borrow only what is absolutely necessary to fight and beat this virus. Diversity studies for the cannabis industry should not be making that cut.

Some of the Democrats' proposals might be acceptable at another time, and I emphasize the word "some." But no matter how worthy the proposal, there is a limit to what we can responsibly spend, and we have to prioritize measures that will directly fight the virus and get Americans back to work.

Republicans are also focused on developing measures that will help fight the virus and get our economy going again without spending trillions of dollars—something I might recommend to my Democratic colleagues. We are currently working on a package of liability protections. Personal injury lawyers are already filing coronavirus-related cases, and we need to ensure that frivolous lawsuits don't hamstring our economic recovery while ensuring that real cases of gross negligence and misconduct are punished.

We are considering a lot of other measures to provide relief while driving up the national debt as little as possible, such as regulatory reform and tax protection for healthcare workers who cross State lines to provide their services. I am pushing for approval of my Mobile Workforce State Income Tax Simplification Act, which I introduced last year, along with Senator SHERROD BROWN.

Our legislation would create an across-the-board tax standard for mobile employees who spend a short period of time working across State lines. It would ensure that States receive fair tax payments while substantially simplifying tax requirements for employees and employers. This legislation has particular relevance in the age of coronavirus, with doctors and nurses crossing State lines to voluntarily work in States that have been hit hard by the pandemic.

The Governor of New York is looking to cash in on the pandemic and has already threatened to subject these medical professionals to New York's income tax. We need to make sure that doctors and nurses who travel to other States to help fight the coronavirus aren't rewarded with big tax bills.

Partisan messaging bills, such as the one the House Democrats passed last week, are a waste of Democrats' time but, more importantly, do nothing to serve the American people. How many hours did the Democrats spend on their massive liberal wish list—hours that could have been spent working with Republicans to come up with real relief

measures? But that is pretty much par for the course for Democrats these days. They are intent on remaking America according to their ever more extreme leftist agenda. They are certainly not going to let a national crisis get in the way. In fact, more than one leader of the Democratic Party has spoken with pleasure of the opportunity the pandemic presents to remake America in their far-left image.

It is deeply disappointing that Democrats are more focused on their pet projects than on addressing this pandemic and its consequences, but that will not stop the Republican-led Senate from moving forward with the business of the American people, and I hope that Democrats will eventually decide to join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rash nomination?

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Baldwin	Feinstein	Paul
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Peters
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoeben	Rosen
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kaine	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Smith
Cotton	Leahy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Loeffler	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Duckworth	McSally	Warner
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Murphy	

NAYS—20

Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Harris	Reed	Wyden
Heinrich	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	Markey	Sanders
Brown	Rounds	Whitehouse

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the President's action.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

NOMINATION OF JAMES E. TRAINOR III

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, we are here to vote on a nominee, James Trainor, to be a Commissioner at the Federal Election Commission—the independent agency responsible for enforcing Federal campaign finance laws.

I am deeply disappointed in today's vote, which is a departure from the Senate's longstanding tradition of considering FEC nominees on a bipartisan basis and another step in eroding the traditions of the Senate—all for a candidate who holds extreme views toward the agency to which he would be appointed.

Prior to today, the Senate has voted to confirm 47 FEC nominees, and 42 of those nominees have been confirmed through a bipartisan process. As the ranking Democrat on the Rules and Administration Committee, I have repeatedly urged my Republican colleagues to work with us to get the FEC running again, as it is unacceptable that the agency charged with protecting the integrity of our campaign finance system has been without a quorum for 261 days—the longest period without a quorum in the agency's history—but this is not the way to do it.

The FEC has been plagued by partisan gridlock for years. With a general election only 168 days away, we should be working together to make sure that the agency is working to the fullest extent possible. Americans are tired of hyperpartisanship and gridlock. This is not the time to abandon the bipartisan tradition of moving FEC nominees together. We need to work to restore their trust in our political institutions, and with this vote, we are taking a

step backward. We all know that our campaign finance system is broken. Everyone in this room knows it. Spending on campaigns has gotten out of control, and special interest groups are a major part of the problem.

Experts suggest that at least \$6 billion will be spent in the 2020 election cycle on political advertisements alone. That doesn't count the billions that will be spent by the campaigns themselves and the additional billions spent by dark money groups and special interests which are trying to influence this election. In order for our democracy to work, we need strong rules for campaign spending, and we need a strong agency to enforce those rules. We should be working together, on a bipartisan basis, to propose solutions to try to get the FEC back on track.

I have a few ideas. We should work together to pass legislation to reform the FEC's rules so it functions better. We should establish a working group that will investigate bipartisan solutions to improve the function of the FEC. We should also work together to elect strong nominees from both parties who will serve on the Commission with the understanding that they are there to enforce the law and protect our election system—and, oh, does this election system need protecting right now.

We are in the midst of a pandemic. We have people standing in garbage bags and homemade masks in the rain in Wisconsin just trying to exercise their right to vote. Nearly 50 of those people got sick. We have a poll worker who got sick. We have States all over the country, with both Democratic and Republican Governors, that are desperately trying to get funding so we can have more at-home voting and have the polls open earlier and have them open for days so people don't have to all congregate on 1 day, and on that day we have to also make our elections safer. We have a lot to do.

When it comes to elections, we know that the enforcement agency for things like campaign finance is the FEC. We know it is broken, and we as a body should work to improve it.

My Republican colleagues, on this particular nominee, have repeatedly said that by confirming Mr. Trainor they are doing some good restoring a quorum. OK. That is not the full story of this nomination. It ignores the fact that gridlock will persist, and Republicans have intentionally left a Democratic seat on the Commission vacant for more than 1,100 days.

It ignores the fact that Leader SCHUMER and I referred a Democratic candidate to the White House for consideration and that she has been vetted and cleared. She is immensely qualified, and she would be the first person of color to ever sit on the FEC. Yes, that is right, the first person of color not only in this Congress but the first person of color in the history of the Federal Elections Commission to serve on the Commission.

Since Republicans refuse to move forward in a bipartisan manner, the agency charged with enforcing our campaign finance laws will continue to remain ineffective. This undermines our country's political institutions, and it does not serve our country's best interests.

Many people refer to the Senate as the world's greatest deliberative body because the Senate, as an institution, is designed for the careful consideration and debate of legislation and nominations. When we erode the bipartisan norms that make us the greatest deliberative body, we end up allowing unqualified nominees who hold extreme views to be appointed to important positions in our government just at a time when we should be doing the opposite.

In addition to these process concerns, today we are also being asked to move forward with a nominee to the FEC who doesn't believe in basic campaign finance law. The FEC was created to enforce campaign finance law, so it is critical that the agency be staffed by Commissioners who believe in its mission so it can police people from both parties.

Mr. Trainor has consistently worked to dismantle the rules that keep corruption out of our political system. He has spent his career arguing that people should not have to disclose political spending and has worked to stack the deck against voters by gerrymandering districts in Texas to dilute minority voting power.

Trainor's views on disclosure are inconsistent with decades of Supreme Court precedent, including the views of late Justice Scalia. When fellow Republicans in the Texas Legislature worked to require politically active nonprofit organizations to disclose their donors, Trainor challenged them and said that such a law "would have a chilling effect on anybody's ability to speak."

Let's just step back. Those were fellow Republicans on the Texas Legislature simply trying to put some reforms in place so we knew where those donations were coming from, and he spoke out against that.

Moving forward with this nomination today may restore a quorum, but it does not serve the American people. The American people deserve an FEC that works, an agency that enforces the law and protects our political system from corruption. At a time when unprecedented amounts of dark money and foreign money are flowing into our elections and influencing our courts, a fully functioning FEC is critical to safeguarding our political system.

When it comes to the agency in charge of enforcing our campaign finance laws, the absolute minimum qualification should be that the person actually believes in the mission of the agency. Is that too much to ask?

We need to focus on how we can help the American people safely vote during this pandemic. I mean, we need to

focus on this pandemic, instead of the series of votes that we have seen this week, but if we are going to decide who should serve on the FEC during this pandemic, it should be someone who believes in the mission of the FEC.

We need to work together to hold hearings with bipartisan groups of election officials, like we have been working to do on the State level when it comes to how to vote in this pandemic. There has been a lot of good work going on with Republicans and Democrats, Governors and Secretaries of State. We need to do the same thing in this Chamber as we approach major legislation and as we approach our working with the FEC.

I oppose the process by which this nominee has come to the floor, and I believe the nominee's extreme views are disqualifying for this important office. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this nominee.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2023.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Rob Portman, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2023, shall be brought a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeben	Romney
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Loeffler	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—7

Alexander	Markey	Whitehouse
Brown	Rounds	
Burr	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 50, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission for a term expiring April 30, 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, Americans have come together in this moment. We have come together to defeat the coronavirus. We have come together to ramp up testing, to ramp up healthcare, and to reopen our communities and our country.

The coronavirus has brought out the best in so many ways in America and in the American people. From our frontline healthcare workers taking care of patients to scientists and researchers working on testing, on treatment, and on vaccines, to those in public service keeping essential parts of the government running day in and day out, to those working on supply chains to deliver goods 24 hours a day, and to those who are staying at home to keep themselves and keep others safe, Americans are in this together.

It is interesting because all we are seeing from the other side of the political aisle is more of the same old politics and name-calling. President

Obama is taking cheap shots at President Trump; Speaker PELOSI just put out a \$3 trillion bill that reads like the Democratic Party platform; and Joe Biden is holed up and hiding in his basement. Is this the best the Democrats can offer? Is this the best they can do? Biden, Obama, and PELOSI should be embarrassed. This is not leadership.

Republican policies in the CARES Act that we passed actually have had significant results—real results—with the Paycheck Protection Program making sure 50 million Americans are still getting their paychecks, economic impact payments, which are reaching 130 million families. These are policies that are going to build a bridge for the country to get to the other side of the devastation done by the virus, and, still, more money and resources from the CARES Act are slated to go out to States, to hospitals, and to small businesses all across America.

All together, between Congress and the Federal Reserve, we have injected close to \$9 trillion into the economy in just a couple of months. All of this money is nowhere close to having even been spent. In fact, it is only because of the steps we have taken already—the efforts of Governors across the country, the work of this administration—that the House Democrats have found themselves in a position, as they were last Friday, of wasting time and energy on a fantasy bill.

Republicans now have two jobs. The first is to get the country back on track, and the second is to not allow the Democrats to try to exploit the crisis that is upon this country for their own political gains.

Democrats are pushing their agenda as a cure-all for the virus. Let me be clear. It is not. It is simply a solution for their electoral problems.

Yesterday, the New York Times published a front page article. Online it was called “Seeking: Big Democratic Ideas That Make Everything Better.” In the printed copy, they changed the headline to say: “Biden Pursues Ideas to Match Scale of Crisis,” “Left Senses an Opening for a Bolder Agenda.” The article goes step by step on how the pandemic is being used by the Democrats to make sweeping changes in their policy platforms in their effort to remake America, basically consistent with their dangerous Democratic socialist views.

They are planning, according to this, to get rid of their so-called center-left policies that they had additionally and initially envisioned. They are now courting what they call leftwing allies. They are adopting the ideas of single-payer healthcare—one size fits all healthcare, with the government making decisions for you rather than you or your doctor making decisions for you. They are adopting ideas through labor unions, liberal think tanks, progressive institutions. They have taken over the Democratic Party, and they are all beholden to NANCY PELOSI.

Democrats are using the coronavirus so that their favorite groups get a giveaway. That is what it reads when you take a look at that \$3 trillion bill that NANCY PELOSI dragged across the floor of the House last Friday night with Members of her party kicking and screaming about voting for it. That is what we see.

Some were kicking and screaming because the \$3 trillion bill that started as a \$1.5 trillion bill didn't get big enough, didn't include enough of their far left socialist agenda. This is not a solution for the crisis facing America. It is not a solution for the crisis that we are facing with coronavirus. It is not a solution that we are facing with a crisis of a shut-down economy, shut down by the government in an effort to protect ourselves from the disease. Oh, no. What we see here is a partisan political playbook. It is the Democrats' agenda for the 2020 election.

The efforts to get the coronavirus behind us and get our communities and our country open must be targeted, must be temporary, and must be tailored to the needs of our communities at this critical time in our Nation's history. Ultimately, it is time for America to open swiftly and smartly and safely.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I first want to give a thank-you to everybody who is working right now and all the folks who are required to be here with the Senate in session. I wish we were focused on those things right now that are directly related to making sure everybody is going to be able to continue to be safe and to focus on what we need to do to safely reopen the economy rather than what we are voting on this week. I want to thank all of you for being here.

I also want to send condolences and thoughts to everyone who has lost a loved one in this crisis. We are approaching, this weekend, 100,000 Americans. If that doesn't give us a sense of urgency right now to effectively address this health pandemic and to get this right and to work together, I don't know what does.

I rise today with a real sense of urgency. I think it is important to understand how we got here so we know what we need to do going forward.

On January 20, the first case of COVID-19 was reported in the United States, the same day as the first case in South Korea. Our White House didn't act. They were, unfortunately, more worried about the stock market than people in the supermarket.

In South Korea, they did act. Within 8 weeks, they were testing 40 times more people per 1 million of their citizens than we were. By April 14, they had 10,000 cases, and we had over 600,000 cases because there was no sense of urgency to do what needed to be done to take this seriously. Now we know that we are well beyond that.

Unfortunately, on the American side, in the weeks and months that came after January 20, the White House slow-walked declaring a national emergency. They failed to quickly implement widespread testing that was being done all around the world and in every other country, and they dropped the ball on getting the essential medical equipment and supplies doctors and nurses still need to treat people and keep them safe. Their reckless delay made us the world leader—the world leader—in the number of COVID-19 cases and deaths. When you think about it, we are a little over 4 percent of the world's population; yet we have about 30 percent of the deaths because of a lack of urgency and the inaction from the very beginning to be able to get our country's arms around this deadly virus and what was happening.

Now 4 months have passed, and as I mentioned, more than 90,000 to 100,000 Americans have passed away from COVID-19. Think about that. When we look at over 90,000 lives, that is as if a whole city in Michigan just disappeared from the map; yet the White House and the Republican leader and our friends across the aisle continue to show a lack of urgency about this crisis.

On March 14, the House of Representatives passed the Families First Coronavirus Response Act. It had a whole range of things that were incredibly important in it: COVID testing so that you could get free testing if you needed it, increased Medicaid funding for States, extended unemployment help for more workers. It established 14 days of paid sick leave for people who lost their paychecks because they had to stay home due to the virus, and the bill provided nutritional food for moms and babies and families. Yet the Senate leader felt no urgency to pass it right then. The House passed the bill on a Friday night, in the middle of the night. All we had to do was to stay until Saturday and get it done, but there was no sense of urgency for the nurses and the doctors and the unemployed workers and the small business owners and the hungry families. They had to wait. They had to wait until the next week, for the Senate leader to go home for the weekend. The leader returned to Washington, but his sense of urgency still wasn't there.

So, while the White House didn't act and the Republican leader didn't act, I will tell you who did act: The Governors acted. Democratic and Republican Governors stood up, and they leaned in to protect their citizens. I am so grateful for what our Governor and her great team have done in Michigan and for all of our mayors and local communities that leaned in, for their taking whatever resources were available and putting them right out there to make sure people's lives were being saved—the No. 1 priority. They have been stepping up and taking the action needed to save lives over and over and over again in this crisis.

Frankly, that is what the White House said should happen. Remember the words of President Trump's when he tweeted:

Governors must be able to step up and get the job done. We will be with you all the way.

Unfortunately, when he said "all the way," he actually meant to find your own way, which puts us where we are right now, today, in trying to help them get resources for critical State and local services.

The vacuum of Federal leadership has real-life consequences. I released a report today that shows the price American families will pay if the White House and congressional Republicans refuse to support State and local services. Our Democratic Policy and Communications group, which is supported by all of the Democratic Senators, is saying we have to act. There are real consequences. Families and communities will pay the price if we do not act and step up and have their backs.

Through no fault of their own, our States and local communities are facing critical budget shortfalls—up to \$650 billion over 3 years—that far exceed what States lost after the great recession. Without urgent Federal assistance, these cuts will affect our safety, our children's educations, and our quality of life. Yet the Republican leader said he has not yet "felt the urgency of acting immediately." Maybe States should go bankrupt, he said.

I can tell the White House and the Republican leader who feels the sense of urgency. He is the healthcare worker who has been laid off and doesn't know when he will get paid and what he is going to do to take care of his family. He is feeling a sense of urgency. He is the student whose school might have to be cut back, and they are the teachers who are going to be laid off through the severe budget cuts. They feel a sense of urgency. The woman who can't continue treatment for opioid addiction because of cutbacks at her local community behavioral health center feels a sense of urgency right now. It is the community that is cutting back on its police and fire departments and the 9-1-1 call centers in order to save money because the President said that he would be with them all the way but who now is saying "No way. You are on your own" that feels a sense of urgency. She is the mom who is waiting in line for hours in her car at the local food bank to try to get some food for her children for today, not next month. It is not "Hey, we have 2 or 3 months." She wants them to eat today and tomorrow and the next day. She feels a sense of urgency.

Americans across the country are feeling a sense of urgency, and it is urgent that we act to meet this moment so that they understand, in this horrendous moment and through no fault of their own—the health crisis and the economic crisis and so on—that someone really does have their backs. We need to help our State and local gov-

ernments continue paying vital workers who educate our children and keep us safe and provide all of the essential services. We need to extend unemployment benefits so that people who are out of work will be able to pay the rent and feed their children. We need to approve access to healthy foods for families in need right now. We need to create a heroes fund to ensure that essential workers who have taken the most risk to keep our country running, to keep us safe, and to save lives during this pandemic receive the additional hazard pay, the compensation, that they deserve.

They need to know they are essential and not expendable. Just saying thank you is good, but it is not enough when you are worried about paying your own mortgage while you go to work to save somebody else's life or put food on your own table for your family. Our country can do better for them. That is what the House bill did. That is what the Senate needs to do.

We need to invest in our State and local health departments so that we can continue to fight the virus and keep our communities safe. That should really be a no-brainer right now, the fact that we need to support our health departments that are on the frontlines of tracking what is happening and get the critical information so the right decisions can be made to keep us safe and the right decisions can be made so as to safely reopen our economy, which we all want and know needs to happen.

Actions have consequences. I am here to say that inaction also has consequences. Inaction has consequences. We are losing lives; we are losing time; and every part of the economy is being affected. It is time to act. It is time for this Senate to act, not on more judges over and over and over again, but on the things that the American people need to have happen, that the people of Michigan need to have happen so they can be healthy and survive the virus and also be able to survive economically for their families, for their businesses, for their farms.

MITCH MCCONNELL may not feel a sense of urgency, but I do on behalf of the people of Michigan. It is time for the Senate to act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Connecticut, that I be recognized to speak for whatever time I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I concur in the remarks of my friend from Michigan. A lot of our constituents have long thought that there has just been an enormous gulf between the

conversations that we have in the U.S. Senate and the conversations that are going on at people's kitchen tables, that are going on between friends and neighbors at the supermarket. They think that what we worry about here is guided by lobbyists and K Street and political action committees and that it really doesn't have much to do with what they care about.

I don't know that their perception of that gulf has been any bigger than it is right now because the message that Senator MCCONNELL and the Senate Republicans are sending is that there is no urgency, that there is no need for the Senate to act, that we have done everything that needs to be done for the time being when it comes to the depression levels of unemployment in this country, the lines that go on for blocks for families who can't afford food to pick up groceries and the schools that are scrambling to figure out how the heck they are going to reopen with the revenues for their municipalities and counties and States that are cratering through the floor.

So it just tears people's hair out right now to know that there is a piece of legislation that has been passed in the House of Representatives that will help millions of families who are in meltdown crisis right now as they have lost their jobs, as they, maybe, have sick loved ones, and as they don't know when life will get back to normal, but the Senate is doing nothing.

I understand my Senate Republican friends wouldn't have written the bill that passed in the House. It is understandable in that there is a different party in control of the Senate than is in control of the House of Representatives. Of course, there is going to be a difference in priorities. Yet the decision to not even take up the House bill—to not try to amend it, to not try to draft a version of our own to fill these enormous gaps that families are feeling right now—is maddening to the people whom I represent back home who feel that sense of urgency that is not shared by the folks who haven't lost their salaries or their healthcare benefits in the U.S. Senate.

Earlier today, we tried to take a small step forward to better protect our constituents and try to bring this pandemic to an end. Senator DURBIN offered a pretty simple resolution that would have just expressed the sense of the Senate that we should join with nations around the world to try to develop a vaccine for COVID. I don't agree with the President. I don't think that it is all hopeless until we find a vaccine. I think that we can take steps in our communities through State leaders to try to reopen our economy even before we have a vaccine. Obviously, that is the goal for which we all strive, and we are much better off if we work with other countries to develop that vaccine.

As we speak, there are very promising discoveries that are being made in other countries. Many of the countries are allies of the United States.

There is, in fact, an international effort underway to help pay for that vaccine development. Probably the most prominent of those efforts is something called CEPI, the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations. Curiously, though, all of our friends—all of our allies—and some of our adversaries are members of that coalition, but the United States is not. So, if this coalition were to develop a vaccine and if it were to get there before the United States, then we wouldn't have a seat at the table to be able to decide where that vaccine goes. It is a question as to whether we would be able to get it to the United States if we are not sitting at that table. Why not hedge our bets?

I hope the dollars that we have proposed here in the U.S. Senate lead to the discovery of a vaccine's happening here, but if it doesn't, why would we not also want to be part of a coalition like CEPI so that, if it were to discover the vaccine first, we would get the benefit of it or, at the very least, we would get a say in where it would go. That is all the resolution said. Yet we couldn't get it passed.

This resolution was especially important because there is something extraordinary happening right now. It is not as if the Trump administration has decided that it is not going to go forward with membership in CEPI because it is going to lead a different international coalition. No. In fact, the Trump administration is taking a giant step back from the world and from international organizations just at the moment when it is the most necessary for us to be cooperating with the rest of the world in finding a vaccine or in stamping out this virus.

Remember, how we stopped Ebola from becoming a crisis in the United States is by being present in Africa to make sure that it didn't reach our shores. The Obama administration understood that travel bans and walls couldn't stop a virus from entering one's country, so you have to stamp it out everywhere in order to be protected here. So, just at the moment we need to be more engaged with the world, the Trump administration is withdrawing us from it.

Witness the President's unprecedented attacks on the WHO. Now, there is a stipulation. The WHO is not unlike any other major, multinational, international organization. It has flaws, and it has inefficiencies, but there is no way you can stand up an international coalition to manage the coronavirus or prevent the next pandemic without the World Health Organization. Color me skeptical that the President is sincerely interested in reforming the WHO. It seems as if it has been a fairly recent interest of the White House. One of the ways I can tell that is that we have a seat on the governing board of the WHO. If we have legitimate grievances over how the WHO is run—and I am amongst those who has a laundry list of reforms I would like to see at the WHO—then the proper way to ex-

press those grievances would be through our seat on the board of the WHO. But do you know what? It has been vacant for 3 years. The Trump administration hasn't put anybody on the board. It nominated somebody, but then Senator MCCONNELL didn't bring him up for a vote. Then his name had to be withdrawn, and it took another 10 months for the Senate to finally put somebody on it in the middle of this crisis. So we have been absent from the WHO for 3 years.

Now the Trump administration is leveling some pretty serious criticisms at that organization. Many of them are crystallized in a letter that the President released to the world last night. What is extraordinary about this letter is that it is almost as if the President took a letter that detailed his administration's failings with respect to how it addressed the early moments of coronavirus and just substituted in the WHO for the Trump administration, because in this letter to the WHO, it reads: "The World Health Organization has repeatedly made claims about the coronavirus that were either grossly inaccurate or misleading."

Here is President Trump on January 22:

Question: Are there worries about a pandemic at this point?

No, not at all. . . . We have it totally under control. It's one person coming in from China, and we have it under control. It's going to be just fine.

If you want to talk about the leading world figure making misstatements about the seriousness of the coronavirus, it is President Donald Trump, especially in January and February, when we could have been getting a head start.

Further in this letter, it reads: "[T]he World Health Organization has been curiously insistent on praising China for its alleged 'transparency.'"

Here is President Donald J. Trump on January 24. This isn't in answer to a question. This is just an unsolicited remark about China on his Twitter account.

He writes:

China has been working very hard to contain the Coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American People, I want to thank President Xi!

There was no more enthusiastic cheerleader for China and its response to the coronavirus in January, February, and March than our own President.

If President Trump wants to level criticisms at the WHO for being too soft on China, he has to look himself in the mirror and understand that it frankly would have been hard for the WHO to stand up and contradict its most important donor and patron, the United States of America.

On February 7, the President was given this question:

Are you concerned that China is covering up the full extent of coronavirus?

President Trump's answer:

No. China is working very hard. . . . They're working really hard, and I think they are doing a very professional job.

On February 18:

Mr. President, are you still satisfied with how President Xi is handling the coronavirus?

Answer: I think President Xi is working very hard.

Question: Some people don't seem to trust the data coming from China. Are you worried about that?

Trump: Look, I know this: President Xi loves the people of China. He loves his country, and he's doing a very good job.

February 26, the question is:

How can you legitimately trust President Xi and the Chinese?

Well, I can tell you this: I speak to him; I had a talk with him recently. And he is working so hard on this problem. . . . And they're tough and very smart.

There is no one who was defending China more vociferously in January and February than President Trump. It came on the heels of his decision to pull two-thirds of the CDC scientists out of that country, to shutter a program that was tracking viruses around the world, including China, and now the President has compounded that error by pulling the United States out of the WHO, an imperfect but absolutely necessary body that can be the only natural source of convening for a fight to stop coronavirus over the course of this summer and this fall and to prevent the next pandemic.

This is a moment when we should be putting a foot forward into the world and leading—and leading. There is no wall; there is no travel restriction that can stop this virus. Why do we know that? Because the President crowed about his travel restriction on China, and we found out that 400,000 people got here from countries subject to the ban before and after it was put into effect.

He sends out pictures on a regular basis of a wall going up with Mexico. That didn't stop this virus from getting here. We need to be present on the world stage right now.

Finally, if the President's complaint is that China and the WHO are too close, then by withdrawing from the WHO, we are effectively exacerbating the problem that the President identifies as one that needs to be solved. Why? Because yesterday President Xi accepted an invitation to speak before the WHO—an invitation that President Trump turned down—and he pledged to lead the world's response to the humanitarian suffering caused by coronavirus.

Now, color me skeptical about China's intentions, but the fact is, they were on that world stage putting \$2 billion into that effort yesterday, and we were nowhere to be found. The greatest beneficiary that comes from the United States' stepping back at this moment and walking away from the WHO is the Chinese Government. I believe that our security will be defined by our ability to contest efforts by China to grow its

power around the world. We are gifting them—gifting them—an advancement of their power and influence through our refusal to take part in WHO, our refusal to lead the effort to reform it, and our refusal as called upon in this resolution that was objected to earlier today offered by Senator DURBIN to be part of the global effort to try to find a vaccine.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I was sitting through the last two speakers and listening to them. You can tell that it is an election year. The Democrats want to defeat President Trump, and I think sometimes a tactic to use is to get someone's strongest point and try to turn it into his weakest point. In this case, we have heard in just the last few minutes that the President is handling the coronavirus completely wrong, that he is critical of and then he was friendly to—I couldn't quite figure out the relationship with China. I know the Democrats in this Chamber are generally perceived as the close friends of China and President Xi and the rest of them.

Also, to talk about what Speaker PELOSI has done in terms of the bill that was passed in the House and the criticism that we are not taking up that bill, well, all that bill is—we are not supposed to be talking about anything in all of this heavy spending except doing something about coronavirus. This is something that no one had anything to do with. We didn't know it was going to happen. We had no preparation for it. I have never experienced it in my life. Yet I do remember so well when this body, this Senate, was working on a coronavirus bill and we were to be voting on it on a Sunday at 6 o'clock in the evening, and the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, came dancing in. It was the first time I even knew she was in town because the House wasn't in session, and she stopped it. She used her influence to try to stop it and successfully did stop it. The vote was taking place at 6 p.m. on a Sunday night, and nothing happened except a stall from then until 6 p.m. on Thursday night, when we finally did vote on it. In the meantime, how many days passed? How many people died in the meantime?

Then, when they come up in the House and they come up with a bill that is supposedly their answer to the coronavirus, it has nothing to do with coronavirus. It has to do with the very liberal Democratic agenda taking advantage of the fact that this crisis is on us in order to use this to try to get things passed. I am talking about—now, I don't have any notes down here with me. I don't know whether she is using gun control or what other efforts they were using in that bill, but it is one that has no place in the discussion when we are talking about coronavirus.

The tragedy there, the people dying—and to credit this President, I have to

say, he has done a great job in addressing this. He is the one who, every single day, is there with top medical people and afterward, at the end of the day, having a news conference and getting from the public what can we do better that we haven't been doing. He has handled it in a very, very effective way. But that is not why I am here on the floor.

TRIBUTE TO TOM COBURN

Madam President, I would like to read into the RECORD a speech I made here on the Senate floor on December 11, 2014, about another Senator from Oklahoma. I am here with something that is very sensitive to me that I want to share.

I wish to make some unscripted comments, but sincere and from the heart. I hope I am accurate when I say this, that I think in some respect I discovered Tom Coburn. I suspect that Tom and I are the only two who have ever had a major, high level national political discussion in Adair, OK. I remember hearing that there was a very conservative doctor from Muskogee. I remember calling him up at that time and asking him to run for the House of Representatives, which he did. He kept his commitments and did everything that he was supposed to do. I always remember that day.

As Senator Coburn knows, we have a place my wife and I built on a big lake in Oklahoma back in 1962.

A lot of people outside of Oklahoma don't realize that Oklahoma has more miles of freshwater shoreline than any of the 50 States. It is a big lake State. She and I built our place way back a long time ago.

When I drive up there, I go through Adair, and I go through that little sheltered area that is half torn down now. They tore down the biggest bank in town. Every time I go by there, I have to say I recall meeting for the first time with a young doctor named Tom Coburn.

I regret to say that there are times in our service together when we have not been in agreement on specific issues, and I think we have a characteristic in common. I think we are both kind of bullheaded, which has created some temporary hard feelings, but there is one thing that overshadows that. Jesus has a family, and His family has a lot of people in it. Some are here in this room. Tom Coburn and I are brothers.

In the 20 years I have been here in the Senate, I don't believe I heard a speech that was as touching and sincere as the speech I heard from my junior Senator a [short time] ago.

I really believe that in spite of all the things that have happened—and there were some differences, but they were minor—that he never ceased to be my brother, and I want to ask the Senator right now to forgive me for the times I have perhaps said something unintentionally that was not always right and was not always from the heart. But I want my junior Senator to know that I sincerely love him and am going to be hurting with him with the troubles he has right now, or might have in the future, and will sorely miss him in this body.

I ask that the RECORD show that I sincerely love my brother, Senator Coburn.

Madam President, that was a speech I made on December 11, 2014, and it sounded funny because, after the disagreement that we had, he and I were talking just a short time ago, and that was well after this speech I made in

2014, and neither one of us could remember what issue it was that we disagreed on, but we knew there was one there.

Here is the truth. There was no one like Dr. Tom Coburn. There was no one like him in Oklahoma. He was a simple country doctor from Muskogee. He was a family doctor. He delivered thousands of babies in Northeastern Oklahoma. I told him when he was running for the first time: You don't have any problems. All you have to do is get all the babies you delivered and have them bring their families along, and it will be an overwhelming victory.

There was no one like him. He was a true fiscal conservative who stayed true to his purposes. He had skills that made him arguably the most thoughtful adviser in the Republican conference.

I think this is somewhat characteristic of doctors. It is part of their culture. They advise people. People listen to them. And that was Tom. Tom was always an adviser to everyone. In every policy decision, Tom sought to be a faithful steward of the taxpayers' money and a dedicated public servant to Oklahoma.

He had an impressive record of service in the House of Representatives, as well as serving in the Senate with me, but nothing about that legacy would have mattered to Tom. Tom knew what mattered in life. What mattered in life was his family—Carolyn and his three daughters.

Carolyn, I suspect you may probably even be watching right now, and I want you to know how many people in this body—Tom is not here anymore, but how many people love you and Tom. Tom knew what was important in life and in Jesus. He is a brother in the Lord. He is my brother.

He will always be a Member of this institution, but we need to make it official.

So, Madam President, in honor of his life and legacy, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate approve a resolution in honor of the life and legacy of Tom Coburn, a doctor from Muskogee.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR THOMAS ALLEN COBURN

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 583, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 583) honoring the life and achievements of former United States Senator Thomas Allen Coburn and expressing condolences to the family of Thomas Allen Coburn on his passing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 583) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. INHOFE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, President Eisenhower once said: "Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil, and you're a thousand miles [away] from the corn field." Those are wise words from a wise man.

If you are trying to get a view of what is happening across America, you certainly can't get a comprehensive picture staying here in Washington, DC, or even listening to the national media. That is why, whether working on a farm bill, a highway bill, or a coronavirus recovery bill, I look to my constituents for feedback. I know we all do the same.

Since we first learned that evacuees from China would be headed to Joint Base San Antonio for a 14-day quarantine, I have been in close contact with the folks in Texas—starting in San Antonio—about the coronavirus. I have joined dozens, if not 100 or more, videoconferences with groups covering every industry that have shared honest perspectives about how things are going, what is working, and what more is needed from Congress.

I have spoken with nurses and hospital administrators about the need for additional PPE to protect our healthcare heroes. I have spoken with researchers and scientists, even as recently as today, about the ongoing quest to develop vaccines and treatments and, of course, with farmers and ranchers and producers about their struggle to cope with a glut of supply and reduced demand.

I have spoken with small business owners about the impact of this virus on their businesses, their workforce, and their communities. Their feedback has been invaluable to the work of the Senate as we continue our mission to lead America through and eventually out of this crisis.

As States across the country begin to reopen their economies, the light at

the end of the tunnel is getting a little bit brighter, but there is still a whole lot of work that needs to be done. Yesterday, I spoke with some of my friends at Texans for Lawsuit Reform, the Texas Civil Justice League, and a number of other business stakeholders about the critical need for liability protection in our next piece of coronavirus legislation.

We are already seeing that, across America, there is a wave of COVID-19-related lawsuits rolling in. Without action on our part, there is genuine fear that these lawsuits could hurt the very people we need to be helping right now get through this weakened economy.

One of the Texans on the call talked about the vast challenges our healthcare workers have faced over the last several weeks. As hospital beds began filling up, the strain on healthcare workers became a serious problem.

Many States loosened restrictions to allow out-of-State or retired physicians to join the fight on the frontlines, and countless healthcare workers are being cross-trained or redeployed to help fill personnel shortages. You may see pediatricians caring for adults or anesthesiologists working in the ICU.

On top of that, these men and women are forced to make tough, almost impossible decisions every day. They may have half a dozen patients who desperately need a ventilator but only two machines available.

We should not put our healthcare workers in an impossible situation where we ask them to do everything they can to help, and then we punish them by subjecting them to litigation when somebody claims that they could or should have done better.

It is not just healthcare workers, though, who could emerge from this crisis only to be greeted by an avalanche of lawsuits. As our economy begins to reopen, businesses are dusting off their tables, barber chairs, gym equipment—whatever the case may be—and preparing to welcome customers back through their doors.

They are following the guidance from the State and the Centers for Disease Control and taking every precaution they recommend to protect both their employees and their customers. However, despite their best efforts, there is nothing stopping someone who contracts the virus from saying it happened at that particular business and then suing.

One of the people on our call yesterday said his business has faced many lawsuits before, and he knows that, even if you have done absolutely nothing wrong, defending these lawsuits can be a huge, huge expense. He pointed out that causation is of particular concern when you talk about a virus. We are still learning about it, but we know that the incubation period could last up to 14 days, making it nearly impossible to prove when and where the virus was contracted.

While ordinarily it would be the burden of the person bringing the suit to

prove causation, we know that, in jury trials, anything can happen and that this is not enough to stop opportunistic litigation from trying to either get a successful jury verdict and judgment or just a nuisance settlement because of the cost of defense.

Across the country, we are already seeing coronavirus lawsuits rolling in, targeting not only our healthcare workers and businesses but nursing homes, assisted living facilities, universities, governments—you name it.

Without action from Congress, the litigation epidemic will be a big one and will add insult to injury from this pandemic. We simply cannot allow this tidal wave of lawsuits to sweep away our healthcare workers, nonprofits, and businesses who followed the guidelines and acted in good faith. Congress needs to put in place commonsense reforms to protect those who have helped the American people get through this crisis and who will help lead us out of it.

I am working with my colleagues on a proposal that would achieve this goal through temporary and targeted protections related to COVID-19 lawsuits. That includes our healthcare workers who have been on the frontlines battling this pandemic, the businesses that are going to great lengths to safely reopen their doors, and the nonprofits helping their communities during a time of unprecedented need.

Despite what some of the folks on the left try to claim, this isn't a ban on lawsuits. Nobody is suggesting we have blanket immunity. No one wants to let bad actors get away with their bad behavior and to reward it. However, as my constituents told me yesterday, the fear of unrestrained litigation could be the boot on the neck of our economy and add insult to injury for our healthcare workers and others who, in good faith, did precisely what they were asked to do during this time of crisis.

We need to put commonsense safeguards in place to ensure that those operating in good faith and following all the relevant guidelines cannot be sued into oblivion because of a particular outcome when people are doing the best they know how to do during a time of crisis—in good faith—and doing exactly what the public health officials and their government officials are telling them to do.

This is going to be a critical aspect to our recovery, not only in Texas but in every State across the Nation. We have counted on all of these people, from our healthcare workers to local businesses, to help get us through this crisis. We can't let them down now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CAPITO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I rise today to address the healthcare and economic crisis facing our Nation because of COVID-19. According to Johns Hopkins University, more than 1.5 million Americans have tested positive for COVID and more than 90,000 have died. And 1,509 West Virginians have tested positive for COVID, and 68 have died, according to our State's Department of Health and Human Services.

We mourn each one of those lost lives and remember the families who grieve for them now and the friends who have lost a loved one. All of us join together, and we thank all of the heroes who are on the frontline performing lifesaving and life-sustaining jobs during this pandemic.

The economic consequences of this pandemic have been devastating as well, but the health devastation is what really, I think, breaks all of our collective hearts.

On the economic front nationally, the unemployment rate is 14.7 percent, and 36.5 million Americans have filed for unemployment since mid-March—an incredible number.

In our small State of West Virginia, 164,000 unemployment claims have been processed since March, and the unemployment rate is over 15 percent. With these terrible facts and the urgency of them, it is right for Congress to come together to take bold action.

We have enacted four major pieces of bipartisan legislation to help ease this crisis. Most significant of those, of course, was the CARES Act, which passed this body 96 to 0. With bipartisan support, the CARES Act provided \$100 billion for our hospitals and medical providers to help them respond to this crisis.

Together, we created the Paycheck Protection Program—PPP, as everybody knows it—to save jobs and to keep our employers and employees connected but also to save jobs at small businesses and help those businesses survive.

As of this past weekend, 15,972 West Virginia small businesses had taken advantage of the PPP program.

The CARES Act provided direct relief for the American people through payments of up to \$1,200 apiece, and more than 780,000 payments totaling \$1.3 billion have been sent to my fellow West Virginians.

The CARES Act increased unemployment benefits to help meet the needs of those workers who lost their jobs due to the crisis, and we see the numbers. That has been a great benefit.

It provided significant resources for our State and local governments. Our State of West Virginia has received \$1.25 billion to help our State, city, and county governments.

After the CARES Act, despite some delays, we came together again and passed additional bipartisan legislation that provided more funding for the

PPP program and more resources for hospitals, more money for COVID testing. We just sent \$57 million to the State of West Virginia for more testing.

In a bipartisan way, Congress responded to the needs of our medical community, as we should. Our small businesses, our workers, our families, our State and local governments, and our heroes are essential workers. As our communities begin the process of carefully reopening, we know that more Federal resources and additional legislation will in all likelihood be necessary. We all hope that our economy, which only months ago was very strong, can rebuild quickly. But our small businesses and workers will need additional help. There is no question that will happen.

As we face the possibility of a second wave of infections later this year, we should continue to build our stockpile of medical supplies and aid our hospitals.

I have heard from our Governor, county commissioners, and our mayors across West Virginia about the lost State and local government revenues caused by COVID. Allowing the CARES Act funds to be used to replace these lost revenues will make sure that State and local governments can continue to meet the public safety and public health needs. This is critical.

I have joined Senator SULLIVAN and others in supporting bipartisan legislation that would do just that. We should enact meaningful liability reform to protect our hospitals, doctors, businesses, college, universities, and non-profits from lawsuit abuse. Those who do their best to treat patients, following government guidelines, and prevent the spread of the contagious virus should not be held liable when treatments fail or COVID spreads. Unless we act, lawsuit abuse could choke off our economic recovery. And we should hold China—China—accountable for hiding the true scope of the COVID pandemic, making the global spread of this disease much worse.

We should all work on all of these priorities going forward. It is appropriate that Congress should examine the effectiveness of the CARES Act—we have been doing that for the last several weeks; that is why I am glad we are here—as well as the ongoing need for resources before considering continuing new legislation to aid the Nation's response. But legislation passed in response to this crisis should be, as has been in the past—should be—bipartisan, and it should be tailored to respond to COVID and the economic problems that it has caused.

Speaker PELOSI's legislation that passed the House of Representatives on Friday night fails on both of these counts. To the extent there was bipartisanship on Friday night, it came from the 14 Democrats who voted against the Speaker's wish list. The bill was certainly not tailored to help Americans respond to the COVID cases.

There were things in there that did respond, but there was a whole lot more that I will talk about that I think was irrelevant.

Speaker PELOSI's bill took a massive step toward federalizing our elections. That is the beauty of our elections. They are all different in every single State, and our States have the decisions to make. These decisions should be made by State and local officials and not micromanaged here in Washington. By the way, I think it makes our elections safer that they are not federalized.

The bill prohibits States from requiring a photo ID to vote and requires States to allow same-day voter registration, something we do not do in the State of West Virginia. Aside from being bad policy, what does that have to do with COVID or helping small businesses and working families?

The word “cannabis,” as we might have heard already today, appears in Speaker PELOSI's bill 68 times. The bill requires a report to make sure that women and minorities are able to fully participate in the cannabis industry, and it makes sure that cannabis businesses are able to access the banking system. By the way, that is an issue that has been worked on since I was in Financial Services 10 years ago. But what does that and how does that relate to COVID?

By allowing stimulus payments to be sent to individuals without a verified Social Security number, Speaker PELOSI's bill would send taxpayer dollars to illegal immigrants, and the bill requires the Department of Homeland Security to review the files of every illegal immigrant in custody to determine if he or she should be released.

Speaker PELOSI also appropriates \$50 million for environmental justice grants. It sounds good—environmental justice. I am not sure what it has to do with COVID, but it sounds good. In reality, a lot of these funds, among other things, assist those who are working to stop industries that are very critical to my State, all the energy industries from coal and natural gas. That is exactly the opposite of promoting an economic recovery in the State I am from.

While working families continue to struggle, Speaker PELOSI's bill offers significant tax relief for rich taxpayers in high tax States. Coincidentally, that is not my State; we run our State on a balanced budget—and very well.

Overall, the House bill costs more than \$3 trillion while doing little to help our economy recover and get our laid-off workers back on the job. There is a bipartisan model out there for working together in response to this crisis. We have done it four times, as I mentioned. But that model is certainly not what the House passed last Friday night.

The Senate is continuing to hold hearings—we are having them today—to learn more about the current crisis and provide oversight. More importantly, we are listening to the people

in our States and their needs and their wants and their fears and their hopes and dreams. I am confident that we will take responsible action to build our economy together, that we will put people back to work together, and that we will help keep our families safe and healthy. Together we can do this.

Speaker PELOSI's legislation will not become law, and she already knew that when she passed it. But we will continue to press forward to respond as one Nation and one people for this unprecedented disaster.

I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture votes with respect to the Manasco and Heil nominations occur at 11 a.m. and 12:30 p.m., respectively, tomorrow; I further ask that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, if cloture is invoked on the nominations, the confirmation votes occur at 3 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. tomorrow, respectively; further, that following disposition of the Heil nomination, cloture ripen with respect to the Badalamenti nomination; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON TRAINOR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Trainor nomination?

Mr. CRAPO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode

Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 96 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Loeffler	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	
Gardner	Perdue	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—8

Alexander	Cotton	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Whitehouse
Burr	Rounds	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE YODER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I give tribute to a lifelong Iowan who has devoted his career in service to families who are mourning the loss of a loved one.

From an early age, Charles Yoder knew what he wanted to be when he grew up. He lived next door to the Powell Funeral Home in Wellman, IA. That is where Charlie's precocious path to his lifelong occupation first started.

Years later, he graduated from the Worsham College of Mortuary Science in Illinois. He returned home to Washington County, where he manages two funeral homes in Wellman and Kalona.

Like many small business people across my State, Charlie's leadership reaches deep into the community. His civic stewardship reflects a character of service to others. He is a member of the Rotary Club, Kalona Chamber of Commerce, Community Foundation of Washington County, and the Dayton Lodge. His public service includes time spent on the Mid-Prairie Community School District Foundation and the Kalona Library.

A member of the National Funeral Directors Association, Charlie participated in its leadership conference here in Washington, DC, for the past 3 years. Like so many other events, the national conference this year was cancelled due to COVID-19. That didn't stop Charlie from stepping up to lead and help his profession navigate these difficult times.

For the past 4 years as president-elect and president of the Iowa Funeral Directors Association, he developed strong relationships across its eight districts, traveling to each one across the State. Networking strengthened his efforts to update strategic plans and foster continuing education services.

This collaboration also helped Iowa funeral directors meet unprecedented challenges from the pandemic. Iowans are known to celebrate the lives of the deceased with large funeral gatherings, attended by many people in the community, who gather to pay their respects and help friends and family mourn the loss of a loved one. Obviously, COVID-19 limited large social gatherings, including graduations, weddings, and funerals.

Charlie developed guidelines to help Iowa funeral home directors adapt to the public health crisis and continue providing safe, compassionate, and personalized attention to the people and communities they serve.

As caretakers in their respective communities, Charlie did not let COVID-19 redefine their mission to serve with professionalism, empathy, and integrity. Working with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Iowa Department of Public Health, Charlie's leadership helped ensure the public welfare was protected and that grieving families and their loved ones remained in good hands.

I thank Charlie for service to his community and his vocation. As he steps down as president of the Iowa Funeral Directors Association, I am pleased to learn a member of the next generation plans to follow in her dad's footsteps. I congratulate him and his wife, Dorie, and wish their daughter Morgan all the best as she starts her studies and pursues her dream this fall.

TRIBUTE TO GLEN TAIT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JIM RUSCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON and Representative RUSS FULCHER, I congratulate Glen Tait, who is retiring from his position as Idaho National Laboratory's—INL—Governmental Affairs Director, after nearly 20 years with INL.

Prior to joining INL in 2001, Glen served as my legislative director when I was first elected to the Senate. During his time guiding my legislative staff, he worked on annual appropriations, nuclear, and other energy issues. He brought with him significant experience and understanding of our great State of Idaho, as he had previously worked as a senior adviser to my predecessor, Dirk Kempthorne. Prior to serving on my staff, Glen's first job in Washington, DC, was working for Vice President Dan Quayle. He served on the Vice President's national security staff as a congressional liaison.

When announcing Glen's retirement, INL Director Mark Peters recognized Glen's excellent leadership as he has worked with our Idaho congressional delegation "throughout the annual appropriations process, securing the participation of INL experts in congressional hearings, and working with Congress and federal agencies to advance legislation and policies important to our energy and national security." Glen has been instrumental in helping us ensure the allocation of needed resources to INL and assisting with Federal policy changes to best support nuclear innovation. For example, we have greatly valued his assistance with the 2018 enactment of S. 97, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, and the 2019 enactments of S. 512, the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act, and S. 174, the Securing Energy Infrastructure Act. These laws are important legacies of Glen's work, as they will ensure the research conducted at INL keeps our Nation at the forefront of nuclear innovation. These measures are a nice capstone to his years of service and dedication to INL and nuclear energy, ensuring that research into advanced nuclear reactors continues and that research is ultimately able to be commercialized and deployed in the private sector.

Glen is dedicated and talented in many aspects of his life beyond his work. He speaks Russian, is an avid gardener, bikes to work, and runs daily. He is a big sports fan, with the Washington Nationals and the California Golden Bears being among his favorite teams to watch. Glen is also very generous with people and cares greatly about helping young people get solid footing in Washington, DC. He is well regarded for his guidance and mentorship, as he has helped newcomers with job and life skills. He has taught many of our staff the ins-and-outs of the lab's research and the science behind it. His patience and guidance are deeply appreciated by many who were fortunate enough to work with him.

Glen, may retirement afford you many runs on the beach and great times with your loved ones, including your wife, Jeannette, and daughters, Lindsey Marie and Hailey Madison. Congratulations on an outstanding 30-year career. We will miss your wit and intellect, and thank you for sharing your talents with Idahoans all these years. We wish you all the best in your retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING WILLIAM SEALOCK

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the distinguished life and career of Aliquippa Chief of Police Robert William Sealock, who passed away on April 11, 2020.

Chief Sealock dedicated his life in service to his community, his Commonwealth, and his country. A veteran of the U.S. Navy, he later served as a police officer in the Borough of Bridgewater and Crescent and Center Townships, located in Allegheny and Beaver counties in western Pennsylvania. At the time of his passing, he was the chief of police for the city of Aliquippa. Beginning as a patrolman and working his way up through the ranks of the Aliquippa Police Force over a period of 23 years, he assumed the role of chief of police in 2018. Chief Sealock was a graduate of Moon Area High School and became a member of the Fraternal Order of Police James Naim Memorial Lodge No. 26 as well as a member of the Masonic Lodge No. 672.

Chief Sealock's leadership has been widely praised by both the public and his peers in the law enforcement community. At a time when his community faced a surge in crime and an understaffed police force, Chief Sealock stepped up to meet the challenge. In just a few short years, Chief Sealock enhanced the reputation of the police department by working tirelessly to rebuild trust and bridge the gap between local law enforcement and the community it served. He also instituted several programs across multiple city offices that were designed to reach Aliquippa's youth and increase participation in group activities.

Chief Sealock led by example. He recognized and understood how important it was to police officers to have the support of their chief and his hands-on approach inspired confidence. As a result, his fellow officers had tremendous respect for his leadership and endearingly referred to him as a "cop's cop."

Tragically, Chief Sealock suffered a medical emergency while on duty which led to his passing. His dedication to the Aliquippa Police Department, his beloved community, his family, and country were guided by a sincere commitment to public service and improving the lives of people he encountered. He will be remembered for his compassion, loving spirit, and warm personality, and his legacy will be felt for many years to come.

I extend my thoughts and prayers to his devoted wife, Donna; his daughter and son-in-law Taylor Sealock-Smith and husband Taner; two stepchildren Jonathan Peterson and Stephanie Snyder, Leslie Patterson and husband Derek Trohaugh; his parents Patricia and James Blaha; his sister Colleen Sealock; his father and mother-in-law William and Dorothy Fontana; and all of Chief Sealock's family and friends as they mourn his loss.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM GODMAN, JR.

• Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to honor a very special North Dakota resident who is turning 100 years old on May 26. William Godman, Jr., now resides at the Haaland Estates Assisted Living Center in Rugby, ND, after living on the family farm north of the community of Churchs Ferry for 98 and a half years. To say this lifelong farmer is one of North Dakota's great stewards of the land would not be an understatement. At his father's urging, he did not leave the farm to fight in World War II because his brother had enlisted. He stayed behind to raise the food to feed a hungry nation and world during those difficult years. On his farm, William has raised crops including wheat, barley, flax, corn, and canola.

Throughout the decades of his life across the past century, William has experienced great moments in North Dakota's history. He and his late wife, Elaine, raised five children and instilled in them the necessity of hard work and self reliance. He gave back to his community in many ways, including being a longtime 4-H leader, church volunteer, and Men's Club member. Although his birthday will not bring together as planned all his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, I hope he will be able to celebrate this great milestone with friends and family at other opportunities throughout the year.

North Dakota is home to more than 200 centenarians, and we consider them among our most treasured residents. Their pioneer spirit, dignity, and hard work have brought them through many challenges and personal achievements. On behalf of all North Dakotans, I wish William a happy 100th birthday and hope this is the start of a year filled with happiness and joy.●

RECOGNIZING NO LIMITS CAFE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a small business that not only serves delicious food, but provides dignified work and promotes inclusivity for individuals with intellectual disabilities. This week, it is my pleasure to honor

No Limits Cafe of Middletown, NJ, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

No Limits Cafe was created to help intellectually disabled individuals achieve their full potential. When their daughter, Katie, was born with Down syndrome, founders Stephanie and Mark Cartier began advocating for children with intellectual disabilities, ID. As Katie neared adulthood, Stephanie and Mark were concerned by the lack of meaningful employment and job training available for people with ID. They believed dignified work provided a sense of pride, purpose, and fulfillment. Employment was empowering. For adults with ID, it could be a life-changing opportunity. In 2017, they began planning a business that would enable adults like Katie to gain valuable work skills.

Over the next 3 years, the Middletown community rallied to support what would later become No Limits Cafe. After the Cartiers bought an old restaurant, local businesses and organizations donated money, materials, and labor to transform the building into a welcoming and accessible space. No Limits Cafe was chartered as a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization, reflecting its commitment to “do good” in their community. Stephanie and Mark developed a two-phase program to fulfill their mission of helping adults with ID gain working skills and independence. First, employ 25–30 adults at the cafe with ID. Then, provide restaurant industry training workshops and place trainees within local restaurants. Near the end of 2019, more than 30 adults with ID were hired as the nonprofit enterprise prepared to launch.

On February 6, 2020, No Limits Cafe opened its doors to widespread acclaim. In addition to gaining marketable skills, employees formed friendships, developed independence, and expressed a sense of pride in their work. No Limits Cafe was profiled in outlets ranging from local news and radio to ABC World News Tonight. Their motto of “Eat Well—Do Good” was clearly reflected in their work.

Like many other nonprofits, No Limits Cafe experienced a sharp decline in revenue due to the coronavirus pandemic. Without enough money to pay their staff, Stephanie and Mark were forced to lay off all 36 employees. They donated the cafe’s perishable supplies to a local food bank, unsure of when they could afford to reopen.

When the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program—PPP—Stephanie and Mark immediately applied. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID-19 pandemic. In early May, No Limits Cafe received a PPP loan. As a result, Stephanie and Mark have been able to rehire all 36 of their employees and will reopen No Limits Cafe for takeout starting Memorial Day weekend.

No Limits Cafe is an outstanding example of how purpose-driven businesses

can positively impact their communities. I commend their efforts to provide training and employment for adults with intellectual disabilities, a historically underserved population. Congratulations to Stephanie, Mark, and the entire team at No Limits Cafe. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 943. An act to authorize the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to support Holocaust education programs, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 76. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”.

The enrolled bill and joint resolution were subsequently signed by the President *pro tempore* (Mr. GRASSLEY).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4532. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Service by Members of the Armed Forces on State and Local Juries” (RIN0790-AK35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4533. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Temporary Amendments to Regulation Crowdfunding” (Release No. 33-10781) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4534. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the Council’s 2019 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4535. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on discretionary appropriations legislation relative to sec. 251(a) (7) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-4536. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled “Amending the American Medical Isotopes Production Act of 2012 (AMIPA)” to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4537. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Certain Timeframes for Employee Benefit Plans, Participants, and Beneficiaries Affected by the COVID-19 Outbreak” (29 CFR Parts 2560 and 2590) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4538. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs of Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance” (RIN1870-AA14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4539. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2020; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Kenneth J. Braithwaite, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of the Navy.

*Victor G. Mercado, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*James H. Anderson, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Air Force nomination of Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Scott L. Pleus, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Daniel D. Boyack, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Joseph T. Guastella, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Gregory M. Guillot, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Dagvin R. M. Anderson and ending with Brig. Gen. Edward W. Thomas, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Dennis S. McKean, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. John S. Kolasheski, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Roger L. Cloutier, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Michael L. Place, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Raymond S. Dingle, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Shoshana S. Chatfield, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Cynthia A. Kuehner, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Yancy B. Lindsey, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Lisa M. Franchetti, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. William K. Lescher, to be Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Dennis A. Crall, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Mark R. Wise, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Steven R. Rudder, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Craparotta, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Karsten S. Heckl, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Adam L. Chalkley and ending with Col. Farrell J. Sullivan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020. (minus 1 nominee: Col. Jason G. Woodworth)

Air Force nomination of Col. Jeannine M. Ryder, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Norman S. West, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Samuel C. Hinote, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Shaun Q. Morris, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Kirk W. Smith, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Kenneth S. Wilsbach, to be General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. David G. Bassett, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas H. Todd III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Jemal J. Beale, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Stuart B. Munsch, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Kurt W. Helfrich, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Joseph B. Lorkowski and ending with Brock L. Yelton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Jonathan L. Arnholt, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Andrew N. Pike, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Chelsey L. Buchanan and ending with Zachary R. Stroman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Reni B. Angelova and ending with Grant W. Wisner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Ricardo Antonio Aldahondo and ending with Noah C. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Yvonne E. Abedi and ending with Jennifer L. Zanzig, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of James B. Hall, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Anthony R. George, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Matthew D. Brill, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Laura A. Abbott and ending with Andrew P. Zwirlein, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Ryan S. Combost and ending with Rachel S. Van Sciver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Megan A. Sherwood, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jonah R. Brown and ending with Jake D. Whitlock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Melanie C. Martin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Samuel C. Horton and ending with Timothy C. Montgomery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Gary A. Anderson, Jr. and ending with Rodney J. Staggers, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Lauren A. Scherer, to be Major.

Army nomination of Shula M. Clark, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jason M. Windham, to be Major.

Army nomination of Tina N. Syfert, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Steven G. Ward, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Aleksandr Baron and ending with Rodger I. Voltin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Patricia H. Passman, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Mark A. White, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Cory J. Young, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Edward K. Graybill, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Javier E. Sostrecintron, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jason C. Derosa, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Mark C. Moretti, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Rockwell Allen, to be Major.

Army nomination of Yong Yi, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Julian P. Gilbert, to be Major.

Army nomination of Juliet O. Thomas, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Philip R. Demontigny and ending with Laura A. Woodson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

Army nomination of Kodjo S. Knoxlimbacker, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Anthony C. Triviso, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Christopher R. Yanity, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Benjamin C. Kessler, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Matthew J. McGirr, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Thomas M. Vanscoten, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of James S. Carmichael, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of La Hesh A. Graham, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jacquelyn M. L. Ketring, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Leslie D. Sobol, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kristen K. Parsons, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Satin L. Ibrahim, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Santhosh K. Shivashankar, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Alejandro B. Sanchez, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Charlene G. Echague, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Anthony M. Pecoraro, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael R. Syamken, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Javier N. Deluca-Johnson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Daniel L. Croom, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Bradley R. Yingst, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Scott D. Stahl, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Brian J. Miller, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Peter N. Alexakos and ending with Michael W. Wissehr, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 11, 2020.

By Mr. RUBIO for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

John L. Ratcliffe, of Texas, to be Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3756. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a renewable fuel feedstock reimbursement program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. JONES:

S. 3757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for businesses and employers to help in the fight against COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3758. A bill to amend the Klamath Basin Water Supply Enhancement Act of 2000 to make certain technical corrections; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 3759. A bill to close high risk wildlife markets and prevent wildlife disease transmission globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3760. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a percentage of student loan forgiveness for public service employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3761. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide veterans service organizations and recognized agents and attorneys opportunities to review Department of Veterans Affairs disability rating determinations before they are finalized, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. REED, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 3762. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the maximum amount of grants awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to States and tribal organizations for operating and maintaining veterans' cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3763. A bill to establish the Pandemic Responder Service Award program to express our gratitude to front-line health care workers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3764. A bill to create Federal child savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. 3765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand tax benefits related to dependent care assistance programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 3766. A bill to prohibit the President from blocking Inspectors General from reporting to Congress and to require a report to Congress if the Department of the Treasury or the White House does not provide timely access to records, documents, and other materials relating to the implementation and execution of the CARES Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 3767. A bill to require States to pass-through 45 percent of the amounts paid from the Coronavirus Relief Fund to local governments that did not receive a direct payment from the Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JONES, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3768. A bill to protect older adults and people with disabilities living in nursing homes, intermediate care facilities, and psychiatric hospitals from COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. LOEFFLER, and Mr. LEE):

S. 3769. A bill to allow States to approve the use of diagnostic tests during a public health emergency; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3770. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform and reduce fraud and abuse in certain visa programs for aliens working temporarily in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 582. A resolution designating Michael P. DiSilvestro as Director Emeritus of Senate Security of the United States Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr.

KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 583. A resolution honoring the life and achievements of former United States Senator Thomas Allen Coburn and expressing condolences to the family of Thomas Allen Coburn on his passing; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 584. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. Res. 585. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2020, as "Silver Star Service Banner Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 586. A resolution designating the week of May 17 through May 23, 2020, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. Res. 587. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 17, 2020, as "DIPG Pediatric Brain Cancer Awareness Day" to raise awareness of and encourage research on diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma tumors and pediatric cancers in general; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BENNET, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 588. A resolution designating May 2020 as "ALS Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 525

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 680

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 680, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 945

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 945, a bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to require certain issuers to disclose to the Securities and Exchange Commission information regarding foreign jurisdictions that prevent the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board from performing inspections under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1792

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1792, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 3131

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3131, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Maya Security and Conservation Partnership program, to authorize appropriations for that program, and for other purposes.

S. 3350

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3350, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deem certain State Veterans homes meeting certain health and safety standards as meeting conditions and requirements for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 3544

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 3544, a bill to assist older Americans and people with disabilities affected by COVID-19.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID-19 crisis by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3612

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 3612, a bill to clarify for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that receipt of coronavirus assistance does not affect the tax treatment of ordinary business expenses.

S. 3635

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3635, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to maintain a list of the country of origin of all drugs marketed in the United States, to ban the use of Federal funds for the purchase of, or reimbursement for, drugs manufactured in China, and for other purposes.

S. 3660

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3660, a bill to provide emergency funding for case-workers and child protective services.

S. 3697

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3697, a bill to modify the Restaurant Meals Program under the supplemental nutrition assistance program in response to COVID-19, and for other purposes.

S. 3698

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3698, a bill to expand compassionate release authority and elderly home confinement access for offenders with heightened coronavirus risk.

S. 3701

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3701, a bill to require the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, to promulgate regulations to provide support to institutions of higher education for the provision of certain equipment and services to students of

those institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 3736

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3736, a bill to increase access to food delivery under the supplemental nutrition assistance program to address the Coronavirus Disease 2019, and for other purposes.

S. 3747

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3747, a bill to help charitable nonprofit organizations provide services to meet the increasing demand in community needs caused by the coronavirus pandemic, preserve and create jobs in the nonprofit sector, reduce unemployment, and promote economic recovery.

S. 3748

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3748, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and lifesaving actions in Vietnam.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 582—DESIGNATING MICHAEL P. DISILVESTRO AS DIRECTOR EMERITUS OF SENATE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN,

Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 582

Whereas Michael P. DiSilvestro will retire from the United States Senate after serving for over 30 years as the first Director of the Office of Senate Security, and in the Senate for over 37 years total, including numerous postponements of his retirement when the needs of the Senate prevailed upon him;

Whereas his career has been dedicated to protecting and facilitating the Senate's ability to review, discuss, and act upon the most sensitive national security information in our Government;

Whereas he represented the Senate boldly and effectively to the executive branch of Government as it delivered critical documents and briefings for the consideration and oversight of the Senate;

Whereas his selfless dedication to the Senate's constitutional function has made him a leader in planning and executing continuity programs for the Senate and Congress as a whole;

Whereas, at great peril, he remained on the front line of service to the Senate in times of heinous attacks on Senate offices;

Whereas he has upheld the highest standards and traditions of the Senate as a universally trusted voice of nonpartisan professionalism and expertise; and

Whereas he has earned the respect and esteem of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, effective May 23, 2020, as a token of the appreciation of the Senate for his long and faithful service, Michael P. DiSilvestro is hereby designated as Director Emeritus of Senate Security of the United States Senate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 583—HONORING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR THOMAS ALLEN COBURN AND EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF THOMAS ALLEN COBURN ON HIS PASSING

Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr.

ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 583

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn was born on March 14, 1948, to Anita Joy and Orin Wesley Coburn in Casper, Wyoming;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn married his wife, Carolyn Denton, in 1968;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn graduated from Oklahoma State University in 1970;

Whereas Thomas Allen and Carolyn Denton Coburn have—

(1) 3 daughters, Callie, Katie, and Sarah; and

(2) 9 grandchildren;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn ran the lens division of Coburn Optical Industries from 1970 to 1978;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn earned a medical degree from the University of Oklahoma Medical School, graduating with honors in 1983;

Whereas, after graduating from the University of Oklahoma Medical School, Thomas Allen Coburn opened Maternal and Family Practice in Muskogee, Oklahoma, where Thomas Allen Coburn served more than 15,000 patients;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn was a dedicated physician whose focus on patients was inexhaustible;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn delivered approximately 4,000 babies during his career and would often see more than 30 patients in his office each day;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn was elected to the House of Representatives in 1994 and served as the Representative of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma from 1995 to 2001;

Whereas, during the 6 years that Thomas Allen Coburn served in the House of Representatives, Thomas Allen Coburn flew to and from Washington, DC, every week so that he could continue to serve his patients;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn served as a Deacon at the First Baptist Church in Muskogee, Oklahoma;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn served as a United States Senator from Oklahoma from 2005 to 2015;

Whereas the annual "Waste Book" prepared by Thomas Allen Coburn became 1 of the more high-profile reports published each year and, collectively, the annual reports highlighted trillions of dollars in questionable Federal spending on low-priority items for which taxpayers were paying;

Whereas, in his farewell speech to the Senate, Thomas Allen Coburn—

(1) said, "We do not have one problem we cannot solve. There is nothing too big for us. They are all solvable."; and

(2) encouraged the members of the Senate to work together to solve the big challenges faced by the United States;

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn will be remembered for—

(1) an uncompromising integrity and passion for public service;

(2) a profound commitment to fiscal responsibility and limited government; and

(3) a deep, unwavering Christian faith; and

Whereas Thomas Allen Coburn was a loving husband, father, grandfather, and son

who passed away on March 28, 2020, at the age of 72: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Thomas Allen Coburn, former member of the United States Senate;

(B) recognizes the life and achievements of the Honorable Thomas Allen Coburn;

(C) expresses condolences to the family of the Honorable Thomas Allen Coburn on his passing; and

(D) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate—

(i) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(ii) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of the Honorable Thomas Allen Coburn; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Thomas Allen Coburn.

SENATE RESOLUTION 584—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 584

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following committee for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Rubio (Chair), Mr. Burr, Mr. Risch, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Sasse.

SENATE RESOLUTION 585—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 1, 2020, AS "SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY"

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 585

Whereas the Senate has always honored the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Silver Star Service Banner has come to represent the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who were wounded or became ill in combat in the wars fought by the United States;

Whereas the Silver Star Families of America was formed to help the people of the United States remember the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces by designing and manufacturing Silver Star Service Banners and Silver Star Flags for that purpose;

Whereas the sole mission of the Silver Star Families of America is to evoke memories of the sacrifices made by members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States through the presence of a Silver Star Service Banner in a window or a Silver Star Flag flying;

Whereas the sacrifices made by members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States should never be forgotten; and

Whereas May 1, 2020, is an appropriate date to designate as “Silver Star Service Banner Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) supports the designation of May 1, 2020, as “Silver Star Service Banner Day”; and
- (2) calls upon the people of the United States to observe Silver Star Service Banner Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 586—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 17 THROUGH MAY 23, 2020, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 586

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, sanitation and waste management systems, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States;

Whereas, during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, public works professionals have continued to provide essential services, placing themselves at increased risk of infection; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

- (1) designates the week of May 17 through May 23, 2020, as “National Public Works Week”; and

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 587—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 17, 2020, AS “DIPG PEDIATRIC BRAIN CANCER AWARENESS DAY” TO RAISE AWARENESS OF AND ENCOURAGE RESEARCH ON DIFFUSE INTRINSIC PONTINE GLIOMA TUMORS AND PEDIATRIC CANCERS IN GENERAL

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 587

Whereas diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma (referred to in this preamble as “DIPG”) tumors regularly affect 200 to 400 children in the United States each year;

Whereas brain tumors are the leading cause of cancer-related death among children;

Whereas, during childhood, DIPG tumors are—

- (1) the second most common type of malignant brain tumor; and
- (2) the leading cause of pediatric brain cancer deaths;

Whereas, with respect to a child who is diagnosed with a DIPG tumor and receives treatment for a DIPG tumor, the median amount of time that the child survives after diagnosis is only 9 months;

Whereas, with respect to an individual who is diagnosed with a DIPG tumor, the rate of survival 5 years after diagnosis is approximately 2 percent;

Whereas the average age at which a child is diagnosed with a DIPG tumor is between 5 and 9 years, resulting in a life expectancy approximately 70 years shorter than the average life expectancy in the United States; and

Whereas the prognosis for children diagnosed with DIPG tumors has not improved over the past 40 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports—

(A) designating May 17, 2020, as “DIPG Pediatric Brain Cancer Awareness Day”; and

(B) efforts to—

(i) better understand diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma tumors;

(ii) develop effective treatments for diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma tumors; and

(iii) provide comprehensive care for children with diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma tumors and their families; and

(2) encourages all individuals in the United States to become more informed about—

(A) diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma tumors;

(B) pediatric brain cancer in general; and

(C) challenges relating to research on pediatric cancers and ways to advance such research.

SENATE RESOLUTION 588—DESIGNATING MAY 2020 AS “ALS AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BENNET, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following

resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 588

Whereas amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (referred to in this preamble as “ALS”) is a progressive neurodegenerative disease that affects nerve cells in the brain and the spinal cord;

Whereas the life expectancy for an individual with ALS is between 2 and 5 years after the date on which the individual receives an ALS diagnosis;

Whereas ALS occurs throughout the world with no racial, ethnic, gender, or socioeconomic boundaries;

Whereas the 2 different types of ALS are sporadic ALS and familial ALS;

Whereas sporadic ALS—

(1) is the most common form of motor neuron disease in the United States;

(2) accounts for between 90 and 95 percent of all cases of ALS in the United States; and

(3) may affect any individual in any location;

Whereas familial ALS (commonly known as “FALS”)—

(1) is inherited; and

(2) accounts for between 5 and 10 percent of all cases of ALS in the United States;

Whereas there is a 50 percent chance that each offspring of an individual with familial ALS will inherit the gene mutation for familial ALS and develop the disease;

Whereas, on average, the period between the date on which an individual first experiences symptoms of ALS and the date on which the individual is diagnosed with ALS is about 1 year;

Whereas the onset of ALS often involves muscle weakness or stiffness, and the progression of ALS results in the further weakening, wasting, and paralysis of—

(1) the muscles of the limbs and trunk; and

(2) the muscles that control vital functions, such as speech, swallowing, and breathing;

Whereas ALS can strike individuals of any age but predominantly strikes adults;

Whereas it is estimated that tens of thousands of individuals in the United States have ALS at any given time;

Whereas, based on studies of the population of the United States, slightly more than 5,600 individuals in the United States are diagnosed with ALS each year, and 15 individuals in the United States are diagnosed with ALS each day;

Whereas, between 2015 and 2040, the number of ALS cases around the world is expected to increase nearly 70 percent;

Whereas the majority of individuals with ALS die of respiratory failure;

Whereas military veterans are approximately twice as likely to be diagnosed with ALS than the general public in the United States;

Whereas, as of the date of introduction of this resolution, there is no cure for ALS;

Whereas the spouses, children, and family members of individuals living with ALS provide support to those individuals with love, day-to-day care, and more; and

Whereas an individual with ALS, and the caregivers of such an individual, can be required to bear significant costs for medical care, equipment, and home health care services for the individual as the disease progresses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2020 as “ALS Awareness Month”; and

(2) affirms the dedication of the Senate to working toward securing cures and better treatments for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (referred to in this resolution as “ALS”) as soon as possible;

(3) recognizes the challenges that individuals with medically determined ALS face on a daily basis; and

(4) commends the dedication of the family members, friends, organizations, volunteers, researchers, and caregivers across the United States that are working to improve the quality and length of life of ALS patients.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1588. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 658, to provide for an accelerated approval pathway for certain drugs that are authorized to be lawfully marketed in other countries; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1588. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 658, to provide for an accelerated approval pathway for certain drugs that are authorized to be lawfully marketed in other countries; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Accelerated Drug Approval for Prescription Therapies Act" or the "ADAPT Act".

SEC. 2. ACCELERATED APPROVAL OF CERTAIN DRUGS THAT ARE AUTHORIZED TO BE LAWFULLY MARKETED IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 506 the following:

"SEC. 506-1. ACCELERATED APPROVAL OF CERTAIN DRUGS THAT ARE AUTHORIZED TO BE LAWFULLY MARKETED IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may approve an application for approval for a drug or vaccine under subsection (c) or (j) of section 505 of this Act or under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act that is currently authorized to be marketed in one or more of the countries included in the list under section 802(b)(1) or the United Kingdom, upon a determination by the Secretary that the sponsor has submitted evidence sufficient to demonstrate all of the criteria under subsection (b)(1).

"(b) CRITERIA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may approve a drug or vaccine under subsection (a) only if the Secretary determines that there is evidence that—

"(A) at the time of application, the drug or vaccine is authorized to be marketed in a country included in the list under section 802(b)(1) or the United Kingdom;

"(B) the drug or vaccine is safe and clinically effective;

"(C) the manufacturer is capable of manufacturing the drug or vaccine safely and consistently, and can assure the safety of the supply chain outside the United States;

"(D) all relevant United States patents or legal exclusivities are expired;

"(E) absent reciprocal marketing approval, the drug or vaccine is not approved for marketing in the United States;

"(F) the Secretary has not, because of any concern relating to safety or effectiveness, rescinded or withdrawn any such approval; and

"(G) the drug or vaccine is intended for the treatment or prevention of a disease or condition that poses a threat of epidemic or pandemic, including with respect to the coronavirus, or the drug is intended to treat the coronavirus, including reduced risk of death, severe disease, and progression of symptoms in individuals exposed to the virus.

"(2) LIMITATION.—Approval of a drug or vaccine under this section may, as the Secretary determines appropriate, be subject to 1 or both of the following requirements:

"(A) The sponsor conduct appropriate post-approval studies to verify and describe the predicted effect on irreversible morbidity or mortality or other clinical benefit of the drug or vaccine.

"(B) The sponsor submit copies of all promotional materials related to the product during the preapproval review period and, following approval and for such period thereafter as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, at least 30 days prior to dissemination of the materials.

"(c) TIMELINE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make a determination on an application described in subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the date of submission of such application.

"(2) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS DURING EPIDEMICS AND PANDEMICS.—In the case of an epidemic or pandemic, including with respect to the coronavirus, the Secretary shall accept and review various portions of an application submitted under this section on a rolling basis, and the review of any part of an application so submitted shall be completed not later than 3 weeks after submission.

"(d) CORONAVIRUS DEFINED.—The term 'coronavirus' means SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, or another coronavirus with epidemic potential.

"(e) REAL-TIME EPIDEMIC AND PANDEMIC VACCINE APPROVAL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a vaccine approved under the authority of this section that is intended to treat or prevent diseases or conditions that pose a threat of an epidemic or pandemic, including the coronavirus, the Secretary shall share data information regarding the approval of the vaccine with the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as the review nears completion.

"(2) EVALUATION.—Any vaccine that has been approved under the authority of this section for an epidemic or pandemic-related disease or condition, including the coronavirus, shall be evaluated by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention not later than 1 week after the date of submission to the Advisory Committee by the Secretary of the vaccine."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have 3 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 19, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 19, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 19, 2020, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Beth Harwell and Brian Noland to be Members of the Board of Directors, and Katherine Crytzer to be Inspector General of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 19, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 584, S. Res. 585, S. Res. 586, S. Res. 587, and S. Res. 588.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles, where applicable, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 584) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The resolutions (S. Res. 585, S. Res. 586, S. Res. 587, and S. Res. 588) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 20; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Manasco nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 583 and do so as a further mark of respect for the late Tom Coburn, former Senator for the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:27 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 20, 2020, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LOUIS W. BREMER, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE OWEN WEST.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION

EDWARD A. BURRIER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MELANIE HARRIS HIGGINS, OF GEORGIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BURUNDI.

JEANNE MARIE MALONEY, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF ESWATINI.

JONATHAN PRATT, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF DJIBOUTI.

JAMES BROWARD STORY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

MICHAEL W. HAIL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2023. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. AUSTIN E. RENFORTH

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

SCOTT H. RASH, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

JAMES E. TRAINOR III, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 2023.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 19, 2020 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

KENNETH CHARLES CANTERBURY, JR., OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES, VICE BYRON TODD JONES, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 12, 2020.